

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XXXI No. 1 JANUARY 1949

RETROSPECT ON LIBERALISM¹

I

ALTHOUGH the name "Liberal" was first used in Spain in the 1820's in opposition to the word "servile", and was intended to denote the party which stood for constitutional and national freedom, the idea of Liberalism goes back much further in history. If it does not belong altogether to the age of the Reformation (in spite of what many history textbooks suggest) it does certainly belong to the seventeenth century. Superficially, it appeared as a political movement directed against monarchy and despotism. It produced those bills of rights or declarations of rights which were taken to be a guarantee to the individual against arbitrary taxation or imprisonment, and promised to him liberty of speech, of the press and of association. On the more positive side the Liberal movement was responsible for the development of what is called constitutional or Parliamentary government, in which the power to rule is conferred in some measure on elected representatives of the people. It is this aspect of Liberalism which is prominent in our political histories and is seen in its great achievements of the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 in this country, or the American or French Revolutions a century later. This is the individual aspect of Liberalism which has been, perhaps, over-emphasized.

The French Revolution, oddly enough, did not work out according to the ideal pattern of 1688. The Jacobins produced a perverted form of Liberalism which ended in mob tyranny and the destruction of individual freedom. Both here and in America the orthodox Liberals reacted against what they saw to be the excesses of the French Revolution. As an American historian has neatly put it, they developed in that period an almost pathological aversion to mobs.²

¹ The substance of a paper read at a Regional Meeting of the Newman Association at Manchester in 1947.

² Carlton J. H. Hayes, *A Generation of Materialism 1871-1900*. The present paper owes much to this remarkable book.

Yet Liberalism was universalist in outlook. It was a doctrine for all men. The ending of the Napoleonic era in 1815 saw the flowering of romanticism, and with it flourished the idea that any people under a foreign rule were oppressed or enslaved, and that alien rule must be in some senses a tyranny. In this way a cross-current came into Liberalism which was in one respect firmly attached to the cosmopolitan and universalist ideas of the eighteenth century and yet was becoming wedded to the ideals of nascent nationalism.

The next stage was the reaction of the Liberal mind to growing industrialism. Here the business outlook combined only too well with the Liberal ideals, and these received support from Puritanism and Nonconformity. The regulation of trade and industry, remnants of a mediaeval past, saturated with religious obscurantism, were merely another form of tyranny which must be overthrown. So we have the introduction of freedom of trade, freedom of contract, freedom to buy and sell, to employ or to dismiss with a minimum of restriction by Church or state or guild or trade union. The elect of God were blessed in their affairs. This was the Liberalism whose father was Adam Smith and whose progeny was the Manchester school.

Here again, however, cross-currents occurred. Some Liberals saw a tyranny in capitalism itself. They saw the individual workman gripped in a wage slavery and they turned with idealism, with romanticism and with much imagination to the doctrines of socialism and anarchism.

Perhaps the most important thing about all this movement of ideas was that it claimed to stand for religious toleration—and hence was always opposed to the Catholic Church. The Church to the Liberal mind was always obscurantist, it was always intransigent, always the foe of individual liberty. Liberals found themselves speaking of it in terms of the tyranny of priestcraft and the shibboleth "theocracy". They set to work, therefore, to emancipate the minds of the young from any clerical domination. There must be liberty of thought, liberty of conscience, liberty of worship and, of course, very little liberty for the Church.

This point brings us face to face with the true problem of Liberalism as it affects the Catholic. The various forms of Liberalism all have a common source. They all suppose both

the natural perfectibility of man and his natural self-sufficiency. It has been said that Liberalism is a way of life, a spirit, a habit of mind, in fact a kind of religion—the religion of “this-worldliness”. It has been described as “a belief in the natural dignity of man”, in “his high destiny”, in “his ability to perfect himself through natural reason and self-determination”, in “the ultimate triumph of truth, justice and freedom.” It has been spoken of as “the consciousness which the free man has of his rights and of his duties”. It is said to stand for “loftiness of view, generosity of sentiment”. It is above all based on the idea that Humanity (always with a capital H) can be enlightened by discussion and improved by the very experience of its own errors. It has got rid of the idea of a personal God. Much of what it says seems at first sight very uplifting and much of it would be inspiring if it only kept in touch with reality. Yet the men who professed this faith rejected any ethical restrictions in either business or political life, and inevitably brought a case of conscience before the Church. When they went further and advocated absolute freedom of thought, of religion, of conscience, of speech and press, and denied any authority derived from God, they ranged themselves immediately in opposition to the Church, whose duty it is to proclaim with God’s authority His message to man.

One of the troubles with the Liberals, in fact, was that they were mesmerized by the beauty of words and failed so often to define their meaning. Above all they failed to face ultimate questions. We have a long array of words which had a profound effect on the thought of the century and eventually did man immense harm. “Liberty”, “Equality”, “Fraternity”, “Reason”, “Natural Law”, “Oppression”, “Tyranny”, “Emancipation”, all led on to the idea that man should be free from every restraint, which means, in fact, that man should be the master and the measure of all things. He is independent of the Divine Law and ends by taking to himself, perhaps unconsciously, the dignity of a god. This is the absurdity at which Liberalism eventually arrived. It, so to speak, consecrated the sin of Adam. And against this absurdity the Church has had to wage a continuous war. She has always held that these principles, if logically applied, can lead only to tyranny or to chaos. She has

had to insist that the only liberty worthy of a man is the liberty to do the things he ought to do, and not just the liberty to do the things he naturally likes to do. She has had to insist on the purpose of freedom and not the technique of freedom—on the end rather than the means.

This is the fundamental reason for the opposition between so many Liberal movements of the nineteenth century and the teaching of the Church. As a result of its principles the whole Liberal movement was a secularizing process which degraded the end of man and which finished by transferring, gradually perhaps, but relentlessly, the social functions of the Church to the state, and of the clergy to the laity. Liberalism, quite unwittingly at first, induced people to look to the secular state as the source both of moral and physical sustenance and hence to regard the Church as something superfluous in social life, a luxury in which one indulged or not, according to one's fancy. It made, in fact, for indifference towards religion, and produced that attitude of mind which makes religion irrelevant to living. Anybody who attempted to arrest this movement was branded as a clerical and the answer to any criticism was a vigorous and sustained anti-clericalism.

This aspect of the movement was not strongly evident in England where the great Churchman, Gladstone, was the paragon of Liberalism. Continental Liberalism, however, especially in the latter half of the nineteenth century, was something bitterly hostile to the Church. It was a sectarian Liberalism, not only anti-clerical but violently anti-Christian. Its outlook was utilitarian, and its creed was based on evolution and the materialist aspects of nature and social science. Its strength was particularly in the radical political parties, in the lodges of continental freemasonry, in the societies, strongest perhaps in France, that were bent on the complete laicizing of the state and of public education, and of restricting the clergy merely to their work in the sacristy.

Newman saw this very clearly as early as 1841, and in the note on Liberalism in his *Apologia* in 1863 he sets out 18 propositions which, as he puts it, "I earnestly denounced and abjured." They emphasize how completely the Liberal attitude is opposed to Catholic teaching on all that relates to revelation

and the supernatural, as well as being dangerous to the social health of the state. Here are some samples :

"No religious tenet is important unless reason shows it to be so" (1). "No theological doctrine is anything more than an opinion which happens to be held by bodies of men" (3). "It is immoral in a man to believe more than he can spontaneously receive as being congenial to his moral and mental nature" (5). "No revealed doctrines or precepts may reasonably stand in the way of scientific conclusions" (6). "There is a system of religion more simply true than Christianity as it has ever been received" (8). "Utility and expedience are the measure of political duty" (13). "The Civil Power may dispose of Church property without sacrilege" (14). "The people are the legitimate source of power" (17). "Virtue is the child of knowledge and vice of ignorance" (18).

The list itself is a tribute to the extraordinary foresight and the penetrating power of analysis which was part of Newman's genius. With his clear idea of what Liberalism stood for, it is not surprising that he declared towards the end of his life: "for thirty, forty, fifty years I have resisted to the best of my power the spirit of Liberalism in religion."

II

In this country the heyday of economic Liberalism in terms of free trade dates from the repeal of the Corn Laws, in 1846, to about 1870, when we see the beginnings of collectivism creeping into the legislation of this country. On the continent the same dates hold good. 1848 has been called the year of revolution. It is signified by the flight of Metternich from Austria, the foundation of the short-lived second Republic in France, the brief, bitter anti-clerical episode of the Roman republic, with Pope Pius IX obliged to flee from Rome, to seek protection in the south. The other date, 1870, means the Franco-Prussian War; the Russian repudiation of the Black Sea clause in the Treaty of Paris; the triumph of Bismarck, the chancellor of blood and iron; and the full emergence of that new terrible

force, the nation state, fighting in arms, not only for existence but for conquest, power and domination.

There are certain great landmarks in the period: 1848, when Karl Marx published the *Communist Manifesto*; 1859, when Darwin published his book on the *Origin of Species*, and J. S. Mill his essay on *Liberty*. This was the year, too, of Magenta and Solferino—the brief glory of Napoleon III's invasion of Italy; the beginning of the triumph of Cavour to make Italy more than a geographical expression. 1866 saw Bismarck break the power of Austria in the Seven Weeks' War. 1870 saw Italian unification achieved. The Pope became "the prisoner of the Vatican" and Bismarck had already picked his quarrel with France.

Is it possible to crystallize this Liberal movement and spirit in a single gesture? Some might say that the evolutionist movement with its idea of inevitable progress, or that the extension of the franchise, is the great characteristic of the Liberal epoch. A more appropriate gesture to single out is its attack on the religious orders of the Church. This started in Portugal and Spain in the 1820's and perhaps the most significant incident in the history of the unification of Italy is Cavour's suppression of nearly 350 religious houses in the little kingdom of Piedmont during the 1850's. More than 4000 monks and about 1200 nuns were expelled from their religious houses. What Cavour did in Piedmont was merely a little beginning, but it was significant; and it was imitated. In 1860 most of the religious houses in Italy were expropriated. In 1868 the Jesuits were suppressed in Spain and with them all communities founded after 1837. Their property was confiscated by the State. In 1872 Germany expelled the Jesuits, and in 1875 Prussia abolished all other orders except those engaged in nursing. France followed a little later. In 1880 the Jesuits and Assumptionists were suppressed or driven out. The battle here was a long one and it was most bitter.

III

During all this time the Liberal movement was being swept off its course or driven into a new channel by the strong cross-current of growing Nationalism.

The Church and the whole Catholic tradition have always insisted on the duty of patriotism as a continuation or an extension of the virtue of charity. And love of country has always been defended in Catholic thought as founded on some of the best natural human instincts. But Nationalism in the sense in which it is condemned by the Church is a vicious thing, an exaggeration, corrupted by hatred, cruelty, snobbery and often bordering on a sort of idolatry. It has been defined as the system or the movement which gives to the national state the supreme place in the scale of values. Its strength lies in its appeal to emotion and to mob instinct. It involves in this sense a sin against reason as well as a sin against faith. In the early part of the nineteenth century this Nationalism, wedded to the Liberal spirit, fought mainly for what was commonly called the emancipation of oppressed peoples from the tyranny of a foreign power. This was the Liberalism of the Prussian revival and the Italian *Risorgimento*—of Palmerston and Gladstone—of Guizot, Thiers, O'Connell and Emile Laveleye. But as the century progressed, Nationalism both intensified and changed its character. It dropped the trappings of romanticism, it ceased to be pacific and broadminded. It grew self-centred, warlike, even imperialistic. And it began to absorb all the loyalties and the energies of the people.

Many surveys have been written of the development and growth of the nationalist spirit. Few, however, have dwelt on two fruits of that spirit which have meant the suicide of Liberalism and the emergence of the totalitarian state. I mean the growth of the system of conscripted military service and the development of the national control of education.

The idea of a conscript army belongs in modern times to the French Revolution, to the *levée en masse*. It was fostered in the fervid atmosphere of the tricolor, the throb of the *Marseillaise*, and exultant devotion to *La Patrie*. It means "the nation in arms" defending its frontiers; and at home the guillotine, destroying the enemies of France.

But scientifically organized conscription is a Prussian legacy. On the principle of universal compulsory army service, followed by periodical training and a long membership of the reserve, Bismarck built up the triumphant Prussian army of 1866 and

1870. Before 1860 the annual intake was 40,000 men serving for two years. That was changed to an intake of 63,000 men serving for three years. After the triumph of 1871 the system was extended to the whole German Empire. France replied in 1872, making every young Frenchman liable to military service for five years. And the French army was remodelled with territorial corps and a reorganized General Staff. Russia followed in 1874 with compulsory service at first for six years and then for five. In 1875 Italy reorganized her army and made every young able-bodied Italian liable for active service for from three to five years.

Bismarck, even after the Austrian Alliance of 1879, was not satisfied and in 1880 introduced another military bill to increase Germany's standing army to nearly half a million men. It is not difficult to see why the historians speak of the last thirty years of the nineteenth century as the period of armed peace—and how the building up of armaments, extending to what Professor Hayes has called "the new Navalism", and the fight for naval supremacy between this country and Germany, was bound to form in the minds of the young all over Europe that sense of unquestioning obedience to national governments, and unthinking support for nationalist and imperialist aspirations.

This idea of nationalist aspirations brings us to the other great fruit of Liberalism, the extension of State interest in, and eventually of State control of, education. It may seem at first sight strange that the Liberal mind which sought the emancipation of individuals from the restrictions of control helped in fact to establish a form of control which has perhaps done more than anything else to condition the minds of citizens to the service of the State and the government. The trouble with the Liberals was that they never thought out their principles—nor followed them to a logical conclusion. It took Leo XIII to do that for them. They represent, in fact, a curious compromise between a pacific cosmopolitanism which was a hangover from the eighteenth century and an aggressive nationalism which became so violently effective in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Thus the Radicals in France, the left Liberals in Italy, the Austrian Liberals, were all more ready supporters of conscription and military expansion in the '60's and '70's than any

of the so-called Conservative groups. It was in like manner the Liberals who were the supporters of policies of administrative centralization and national unification.

The Liberals approached the question of popular education with varying motives. There was, of course, the cynicism of Robert Lowe, who proclaimed that we "must educate our masters". But the intellectuals hoped to see an extension of human progress in the wide diffusion of scientific knowledge. The more materialist hoped to sow the seeds of sound economic principles among the masses and thus strengthen them against revolutionary propaganda. Popular state education, too, would be a means of fostering national patriotism and of fitting citizens for an intelligent share in political democracy—and also in military service. All over Europe in the '60's and '70's elaborate systems of state-supported or state-directed elementary education came into existence. The teachers were almost always lay employees of the government; and religious instruction, except in a most vague and general form, was excluded from the schools. Such systems came into existence or were perfected in Hungary in 1868, in Austria in 1869, in England in 1870, in Switzerland in 1874, in the Netherlands in 1876, in Italy in 1877, in Belgium in 1879 and in France from 1881-86. In Germany, where state schools were already in existence, they were largely secularized in the '70's. The Liberals, with that strange inconsistency which runs through all their activity, seemed to have no qualms of conscience in invoking for the sake of popular education the very principle of state compulsion which they were supposed to detest. In one country after another the setting up of elementary state schools was accompanied or followed by laws imposing the compulsory attendance of every child. They succeeded, it has been noted, in producing a noteworthy increase of literacy if not intelligence among the masses. It is not necessary to go into the various factors which contributed to this movement for mass education in the late '60's. An industrialized society, urban concentrations, easier travelling, humanitarian doctrines, the cry of "equality of opportunity", the hope that popular scientific education would destroy the influence of the Church, all had their part in fostering this movement.

The only question which raised bitterness and controversy

was whether this popular education should include religious instruction or be exclusively lay and secular. At first the secularists triumphed. In Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, France, Austria and Hungary religious instruction was excluded from state schools and barely tolerated in private Church schools, against which, in opposition to all Liberal principles, a form of discriminatory tariff was erected. Only in this country did the government continue to give some financial support to Church schools.

Perhaps one of the most important results of popular education, less evident I think in this country than on the continent, was the recruiting of a staff of teachers who formed what has been described as a sort of officer corps for the army of mobilized children. Trained under government control, teaching under government supervision, their own interests were identified with the strengthening of the nationalist spirit and the attachment of the masses to their representative governments. It would be interesting in this respect to compare the attitudes of the teaching profession, either in universities or in more elementary schools, to the revolutionary movement of 1848 and, say, the wars of 1870 or 1914.

Thus by a strange confusion of ways and yet by an inner logic the Liberal movement has brought us to the verge of the totalitarian state.

IV

What was the Church doing in the midst of these years of change? From 1846 to 1903 two great Popes occupied the See of Peter. At first sight it would seem that their reactions to this movement of thought, which was implicitly a denial of the supernatural, were totally dissimilar. People remember Pius IX because of the Syllabus of 1864 and Leo XIII for such things as the *Ralliement* to the Republic in France or the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of 1891. Yet if we survey these two Pontificates together we can see that they achieve a remarkable unity in defining the attitude of the Church to the new secularist spirit.¹

1854. On 8 December Pope Pius IX defined infallibly the

¹ For this short summary I am greatly indebted to Fr R. Corrigan's book *The Church and the Nineteenth Century*, which was reviewed in these pages 1948, XXIX pp. 44-5.

doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Our Blessed Lady. In doing so he laid down two cardinal principles on which the Church has taken her stand. The first is the declaration that the Pope, and indeed the Church, speaks with the authority of God, and the second, equally obvious but curiously neglected by the contemporaries of Pope Pius, is the teaching that all mankind, save only the Blessed Virgin, has fallen from grace and is subject to sin. The nineteenth century tended, with its ideal of perfectible man, to scoff at the idea of sin. Pius IX threw the whole weight of his authority into that implicit declaration that sin was a legacy which humanity could not escape.

1864. Again on 8 December, Pope Pius IX issued to the Bishops of the Church an encyclical letter entitled *Quanta Cura*, to which was attached a list of eighty propositions commonly known as the Syllabus, which were condemned as errors and pernicious doctrines. The Syllabus made a tremendous stir at the time and was taken to be the last spasm of a dying Church overcome by the enlightenment and progress of the nineteenth century. The condemnation of the famous 80th proposition is the one which aroused the bitterest criticism of the Church. The proposition runs as follows: "The Roman Pontiff can and should reconcile himself and come to terms with progress, Liberalism and modern civilization." This was taken to mean that the Pope was hopelessly out of step with the modern age. The condemnation was just a "reactionary" gesture. Anticlericals felt that the Syllabus justified their attacks and that the Church was truly the enemy of progress. The Pope was the great obstacle to the emancipation of humanity. Yet it is worth while to remember one or two other propositions from the Syllabus before making any comment:

1. There exists no supreme, all wise, most provident divine Being, distinct from the universe; God and nature are one, and God is therefore subject to change; actually, God is produced in man and in the world; God and the world are identical, as are spirit and matter, true and false, good and evil, just and unjust.
6. Faith in Christ is opposed to human reason; and divine revelation is not only unprofitable, but is even harmful to the perfection of man.

18. Protestantism is nothing but another form of the same true Christian religion, in which it is equally possible to please God as in the Catholic Church
21. The Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion.
37. National Churches can be established after being withdrawn and openly separated from the authority of the Roman Pontiff.
39. The commonwealth is the origin and source of all rights, and enjoys rights which are not circumscribed by any limits.
40. The teaching of the Catholic Church is opposed to the well-being and interests of society.
64. The violation of a solemn oath and any atrocious crime against the eternal law is not only not reprehensible but lawful and worthy of the highest praise when done for the love of country.
65. The teaching that Christ elevated marriage to the dignity of a sacrament can in no way be admitted.

It is important to remember that these propositions were all taken from earlier Papal documents and they should be read in the context in which they first appeared. Thus the 80th proposition was taken from an allocution of Pope Pius IX in March 1861. Here is the context: "For a long time we have been witnesses of the troubles into which civil society, especially in our own time, has been thrown by the violent struggle being waged between opposing principles, between truth and error, virtue and vice, light and darkness. For some men, on the one hand, defend what they call modern civilization, others, on the contrary, defend the rights of justice and our holy religion. The first demand that the Roman Pontiff should reconcile himself and come to terms with progress, with Liberalism (these are their own expressions), in a word, with modern civilization". The Papal speech goes on to show that under these specious names of progress, Liberalism and civilization there has been a movement to de-christianize the world and that such a movement should never be dignified by the name of civilization, except in a most materialist sense.

If the Syllabus was interpreted by the Liberals as the death spasm of an outworn Church, the solemn opening of the Vatican Council on 8 December, 1869, was looked upon as a gesture of defiance by the Papacy. The Council was concerned principally

with the nature and functions of the Church and its great achievement was the definition of Papal Infallibility. What it might have done had Rome not been threatened by the forces of the Italian Government through the withdrawal of French troops for the defence of their country is known only to God.

The next ten years was a period of almost open hostility to the Church, particularly in Germany. When Pope Pius IX died in 1878 it looked as though Liberalism and Secularism, in spite of Papal condemnation, were about to triumph. Sixty-five old Cardinals entered the conclave in the Vatican to choose his successor. They acted quickly, perhaps even fearing interference. On 20 February, 1878, they chose Cardinal Pecci, a man of 68 years of age, who had been Archbishop of Perugia for thirty-two years, to wear the ring of the Fisherman. Outside Italy he was almost unknown, though some remembered him as a Papal Nuncio in Belgium in the 1840's. He was thin and frail and not expected to live long. In some respects he was what one might call a makeshift Pope.

Yet Leo XIII lived on till 1903 for twenty-five years to the age of 93 and his pontificate has acquired a fame comparable to that of any of the great Popes of the Middle Ages. Leo might be frail in physique but he had a scholar's grasp of principles, a brilliant mind and a will of iron. He had, further, a sympathetic understanding not only of the intellectual problems of the age but of the social conditions engendered by the new industrialism. He was as determined as Gregory XVI or Pius IX to fight against materialism, agnosticism or indifferentism, but he was not content merely to condemn. With his pontificate we enter the period of the constructive exposition of the Christian alternative to the Liberal way of life.

Leo XIII will always be known as the Pope of the great encyclicals. It would require a whole book to analyse the teaching set out in these great pontifical documents. It is not possible to do more here than to underline some of the doctrines which Leo expounded for the Church. In almost the first of the long series of encyclicals the Pope pointed to the mediaeval scholastic philosophy of St Thomas Aquinas as the great corrective to the errors of modern philosophy. He urged most strongly its revival and extension. He founded and endowed a Pontifical Academy

in Rome for this purpose. He directed the preparation of a new Leonine edition of the Angelic Doctor's writings. He encouraged centres for Neo-Thomist studies at Louvain, Paris, Fribourg and Salzburg. He interested himself personally in the foundation of the Catholic University of America. He encouraged scholars of all kinds. He revived in the Church enthusiasm for ideas.

In the realm of political principles Leo XIII repeated and emphasized the condemnations of his predecessors, but, again, he was not content merely to condemn. In 1881 he laid down the doctrine of the Origin of Civil Power in an encyclical which has not yet been published in English. In two further encyclicals, *Immortale Dei* (1885) and *Libertas* (1888), he insisted that democracy is as compatible with Catholic philosophy and tradition as any other way of life: and that real personal liberty, which he called "God's most precious gift to man" and which is poles apart from the sectarian Liberalism of his age, has its firmest base and surest support in Catholicism. Leo's aim was to Christianize democracy and liberty. In 1891 came the encyclical by which he is best known, on the condition of the working classes. Leo's teaching has become since that encyclical part of the stuff of Catholic sociology. Class is not by nature hostile to class. Labour is not a commodity. Private property is a natural right. The family is of key importance. The father of a family has an inalienable right to a living family wage. He went on to sketch the Christian constitution of states, the duties of Catholic citizens, the rights and duties of both Church and State. Leo's teaching was a complete whole, not lopsided by an insistence on only one aspect of man's life. We have, for example, his condemnation of the title "Christian Socialism" as a contradiction in terms: We have his great letter in 1893 on the study of Holy Scripture, his grand dogmatic encyclicals on the Holy Ghost, the Sacred Heart, the Blessed Eucharist, and his continued insistence on prayer to Our Blessed Lady and the use of the Holy Rosary. It is important today to remember every side of Pope Leo's work. His outlook was truly Catholic and his insistence was on the whole of human life. He wrote an encyclical on the condition of the working classes: he wrote no less than four which deal directly with political life and the basis of civil order and authority.

For the moment sectarian Liberalism was in retreat. There was a strong return, for a time at least, of conservative forces. And yet already in the growing control of the state over so many aspects of individual life there was the shadow of a grave menace for the future—a menace which was always implicit in the Liberal doctrine—a menace underlined by Leo himself, proclaiming that the outcome would be either chaos or tyranny. Europe was passing into the age which heralds the coming of the totalitarian state.

✠ GEORGE ANDREW,
Bishop of Tigua

COMMANDMENTS AND VIRTUES

IT is customary in instructing both children and adults, including converts, in their duties as Christians to take the Ten Commandments as the basis of the instruction. This method has high authority. It is followed in our own catechism and in most catechisms, both ancient and modern, including that admirable guide for pastors in teaching their people, the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*.

There are, however, disadvantages in this method. The Ten Commandments belong essentially to the Old Law. Of course, unlike the old ceremonial law, they are still binding. Still, the fact remains that we are under the New Law, which is far more perfect than the Old. The Old Law was, as St Paul says, the pedagogue of the Jews, whose function was to give them an elementary training to prepare them for the teaching of Christ.

It is true, no doubt, that, if properly understood in the light of our Lord's teaching, the whole of the New Law is contained in the Old. But it is contained, as St Thomas says, "as the whole tree is contained in the seed".¹ In our instruction we naturally explain it in this way, showing how it must be taken in the spirit and not in the letter. But this is not easy. It takes a lot of

¹ *S. Th.*, I-IIae, cvii, 3.

explanation, and sometimes there seems to be a certain unreality about it. We seem to be putting more into the words than is actually there.

Another disadvantage is that nearly all the commandments are put in a negative form: "Thou shalt not." And this is apt to give a wrong view of the Christian life. People may get the impression that it all consists in avoiding sin. It sounds too much like a set of taboos. Some such idea must have been in the mind of the poet when he wrote about "the lilies and languors of virtue and the raptures and roses of vice", or again: "Thou hast conquered, O pale Galilean, and the world has grown grey at thy breath." Undoubtedly many people have that idea, and it is one of the causes of the modern revolt against Christianity. People will not be restrained by taboos. They want to lead what they call "a fuller life". As if any life could be nearly so full as a real Christian life!

Again, too much prominence given to the Decalogue conveys the impression that the Christian law is primarily a written law, which it is not. Let us go again to the Angelic Doctor. In answer to the question: "*utrum lex nova sit lex scripta*", he writes: "*principaliter lex nova est ipsa gratia Spiritus Sancti, quae datur Christifidelibus. . . . Unde et Augustinus dicit, quod sicut lex factorum scripta fuit in tabulis lapideis, ita lex fidei scripta est in cordibus fidelium.*"¹ He admits that in a sense it is also a written law, because to understand rightly the law written in our hearts we need external guidance, which is given us in the records of our Lord's teaching in the Gospels and in the other books of the New Testament. But this is secondary. Principally the New Law is one which is written in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who dwells in us.

This doctrine must, of course, in these days of Protestantism, be carefully safeguarded. It would not do to let anyone think that, even when aided by the written Scriptures, he can learn the whole law from the Holy Ghost speaking in his heart, for no individual can be sure of interpreting that voice of the Holy Ghost rightly. The Holy Ghost does instruct individuals, but He does not make them infallible. Even the best of Christians may mistake his own ideas for the teaching of the Holy Ghost.

¹ *S. Th.*, I-IIae, cvi, 1.

It is only through His indwelling in the whole Body of Christ that the Holy Ghost gives infallibility. Therefore the individual must correct what he thinks to be the teaching of the Holy Ghost in his heart by the teaching of the Church.

St Thomas compares the Christian Law with the Natural Law. Each of them, he says, is implanted (*indita*) in the soul, but with a difference. The Natural Law is made known to us "quasi pertinens ad naturam humanam", the Christian Law "quasi naturae superadditum per gratiae donum".¹ This is very illuminating. For it follows that the individual is liable to err in both spheres. Neither natural reason, which interprets the natural law, nor the reason supernaturalized by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost is infallible. Therefore in both cases we need the guidance of the teaching Church.

Since, then, the New Law is primarily taught to us by the Holy Ghost enlightening each individual Christian, and more securely by the Holy Ghost dwelling in and speaking through the Church, it does seem apt to be misleading if we emphasize too exclusively the law "written on tables of stone". And it is very noticeable that St Thomas does not do so. After explaining the nature of the new law he goes on to say that "the use of spiritual grace is in the works of the virtues, to which in many ways the Scripture of the New Testament exhorts men".² And then he gives that long exposition of the Christian virtues, which extends through the whole of the *Secunda Secundae*, proposing this as the pattern for Christians to follow. And so I suggest that, in our practical instructions to our people, we might well go back to the method of St Thomas, and lay far more emphasis on the practice of the virtues than on the rule of the Ten Commandments, even if we are careful to interpret the latter in a Christian sense.

I am not, of course, suggesting that we should abandon the method of the catechism, which has such high authority. That would indeed be rash and presumptuous. The Jews, before the coming of Christ, were given the Ten Commandments as their pedagogue to prepare them for the perfect law of Christ. And Christians, in the early stages of their instruction, still need that same pedagogue. What I am pleading for is rather that, having

¹ *S. Th.*, I-IIae, cvi, 1, ad. 2.

² *S. Th.*, I-IIae, cvi, 1, ad. 1.

laid that foundation, we pay far more attention than is often done to the expansion of that preliminary teaching by a full explanation of those virtues, in the practice and cultivation of which the following of the New Law consists. And this seems to be particularly desirable in the instruction of adult converts. Otherwise they may get that impression, to which I have referred above, that the Christian law is rather a negative thing, a set of taboos. Therefore let us emphasize the positive pattern of the Christian life as a continual endeavour to practise more and more perfectly the Christian virtues.

It is true that the virtues are not overlooked in the catechism. The lists of the Theological Virtues and the Cardinal Virtues are given in Chapter VII. But they are given as two items in a very miscellaneous collection, including "the twelve fruits of the Holy Ghost", "the four sins crying to heaven for vengeance", "the three eminent good works", and so forth. And it is very much to be feared that often these Chapters VII, VIII and IX are treated as a sort of appendix, to which little time is given in our instructions. Indeed, in that excellent work, Cafferata's *Catechism Simply Explained*, which is frequently and most rightly used for the instruction of converts, these chapters are merely copied out without any attempt at elucidation. Having completed his explanation of the catechism as far as the end of the sacraments, Canon Cafferata writes: "I have now come to the end of the explanation of the catechism as far as I intend to carry it. The rest of the catechism follows; you can read it and probably understand it fairly well." Rather a large assumption!

Now let us look at the picture of the Christian life as depicted in the *Secunda Secundae*, and consider how it can be presented to the catechumen. But first he must be instructed in the nature of the supernatural virtues, and how they differ from the natural virtues. He must understand that, although they are called habits, they are not habits in the ordinary sense, but rather supernatural powers or faculties, which are infused into the soul along with sanctifying grace, and enable us to do works which are super-naturally good, but do not give any facility. It may be a little difficult for him to understand this. He will not see how a baby a week old can possess all these virtues. But a comparison with natural powers will make it plain. That baby,

for example, possesses the gift of reason, but it is not able to use it until the mind has developed. So with the supernatural virtues. They are there in the baptised child, although they cannot produce any effects until the child is older, and they have begun to develop by practice.

Then we can go on to draw out from the *Secunda Secundae* St Thomas's picture of the Christian life. The catechumen begins with FAITH, for "without faith it is impossible to please God". This needs explanation. The supernatural life cannot be lived by the natural light of reason. The way must be taught us by God, and we receive God's teaching by faith.

The catechumen must make an initial act of faith before being received into the Church, by accepting the divine revelation. Disposed by this act of faith, along with acts of repentance and hope, and at least a beginning of charity, he receives the gift of sanctifying grace, and along with that the infused virtue of faith, together with all the other infused virtues. Faith will now be a permanent possession, so that he no longer has to go over those proofs, which led him to the first act of faith, but is able to make acts of faith continually and without difficulty.

But he must learn how to preserve this gift and to increase it. He must be warned that there is a danger of losing the gift of faith. There is no need, however, to dwell here on the causes which may lead to the loss of faith, for they are well enough summed up in the catechism in the answer to Question 178. But he must also be taught how faith can increase. For, although faith excludes all doubt, yet faith can and ought to grow in firmness and vividness,¹ and such growth is effected by praying for it, by thinking about the truths of faith, meditating on them, and by acting habitually with these supernatural realities in view.

HOPE will increase, if we think much about the end that is set before us. It is impossible to form any picture in the imagination of that end, but, if we consider that it is nothing less than God, the infinite Good, in Whom alone we can find perfect and eternal satisfaction, our desire to possess that Good will grow. But hope means more than that. It is essentially a firm trust in God that He will lead us to that end, if we faithfully do

¹ Cf. *S. Th.*, II-IIae, v, 4.

our part. Therefore, to have a lively hope, we must think much of God's infinite power and goodness, and of our helplessness without Him, so that we may learn to distrust ourselves, to put unbounded trust in God, and to pray without ceasing.

It is obvious that the paramount importance of CHARITY must be impressed on the catechumen. In view of the widespread abuse of this word in modern English its true meaning has to be carefully explained. It must be shown how love of God is our response to God's love of us. It is nourished by a quiet and long contemplation of God's goodness. From the thought of Him as the supreme Good springs the *amor concupiscentiae*, which is the desire to possess Him. Then comes the thought: "Quid retribuam Domino pro omnibus quae retribuit mihi?" So the imperfect love becomes the love of benevolence, the desire to do all that we can to please God. Of course we must emphasize the fact that love of God is not a matter of the emotions, but of the will. If we do not *feel* that we love God above all things, it does not matter much, provided that the will is fixed upon Him. Then we try to show how love of our neighbour is a necessary consequence of love of God, or rather how love of God and love of our neighbour are only two aspects of the one virtue of charity; for, if we love God, we must love those whom He loves, and desire what He desires, which is that all men may be drawn into union with Him. And finally we explain how all the other supernatural virtues flow from charity, and are ruled by charity. He who truly loves God and his neighbour will necessarily try to practise prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance and all the other virtues connected with them.

And so we go on to the infused moral virtues. And here we can only follow the *Secunda Secundae*. We begin with PRUDENCE, which governs all the others, defining it as wisely planning out our life, rightly choosing and adopting the means which will lead us to our true end, and carefully distinguishing between what St Paul calls the "prudence of the flesh" and the "prudence of the spirit" ("wisdom" in the Douai version, but "prudencia" in the Vulgate. Rom. viii, 6). We may well illustrate this from the familiar "Principle and Foundation" of the Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius: "Man was created to praise, do reverence to and serve God our Lord, and thereby to save

his soul. . . . Hence it follows that man should make use of creatures so far as they do help him towards his end, and should withdraw from them so far as they are a hindrance to him in regard of that end."

It is very necessary to emphasize the importance of **JUSTICE**, the virtue which inclines the will to give to every one his strict rights. Although, like every other virtue, governed by charity, it must in another sense take precedence of charity. It is sometimes forgotten that we must always give to every one his strict rights before everything else. We are bound to do acts of charity, but not always to do this or that particular act of charity, whereas we are always obliged to do what justice requires. Charity that neglects justice is not true charity. It is not true charity to be generous before we have paid our debts.

It will be remembered that there are a number of virtues which St Thomas calls "potential parts" of justice, and all of which are important. **RELIGION**, when used as the name of a virtue, is that which inclines the will to give to God the worship which is due to Him. **PIETY**, when used in its original sense, familiar in our school days from Virgil's "pius Aeneas", is the virtue which inclines us to honour and love our parents, thus paying the debt which we owe to them for having given us life and caring for us in childhood. And from this it is extended to love of our native country, which is reckoned as our natural mother. It is important to impress upon converts that the Church looks upon patriotism as a virtue. **OBSERVANTIA** is not an easy word to translate. It may best be described as giving honour to whom honour is due. And then there are **GRATITUDE**, **TRUTHFULNESS**, **AFFABILITY** and **LIBERALITY**.

It is impossible to live a Christian life without encountering many difficulties, and to overcome these requires **FORTITUDE**, which may be defined as the virtue which strengthens the will to overcome difficulties in a good cause. Closely akin to fortitude is **PATIENCE**, which may be described as its passive counterpart. The importance of patience requires emphasizing, because, being a passive virtue, it is apt to be belittled in these days, when so much stress is laid on outward activity. But this attitude is quite unchristian, for willingness to suffer patiently for God's sake is one of the virtues which markedly distinguish the Chris-

tian ideal of goodness from the pagan. A Christian is called to imitate Christ, and willingness to suffer patiently was His most outstanding characteristic, for it was by this that He redeemed the world. And indeed by suffering patiently, and offering all our sufferings to God in union with the passion of Christ, we can take part with Him in His work of redemption.

The catechumen must be carefully instructed that TEMPERANCE does not mean abstention from alcoholic drinks. It is the virtue which controls all our natural appetites in such a way as to keep them in conformity with the rules of right reason. It of course includes the proper regulation of eating and drinking, but also the control of the sexual appetite by CHASTITY, and of the tendency to self-exaltation by HUMILITY.

There is just one other aspect of our duty as Catholics which ought to be added to this. It is the duty which our late Holy Father Pius XI emphatically called upon the faithful to perform, an exhortation which his successor Pius XII has often repeated. This is the duty of being apostles, and it is one that ought to be urged upon every convert, as well as upon every "cradle Catholic". We have not received the riches stored up by Christ in His Church in order to keep them to ourselves, but to share them with others. Or, in other words, we are all called to be labourers in the Lord's vineyard. But this is too vast a subject to embark upon now.

What a different picture of the Christian life all this gives from the idea of a set of taboos, which is too apt to result from too exclusive insistence on the Ten Commandments! It gives us rather the idea of a glorious adventure, full of difficulties and hardships no doubt, but full of happiness too, for it is a striving after the highest aim that has been made known to man, and at the heart of it all is that love, which makes all things easy—God's love for us and our response to it.

G. J. MACGILLIVRAY

LUDWIG WINDTHORST AND THE GERMAN
CENTRE PARTY

THE story of Catholic parliamentary parties will form an interesting chapter in the history of the Church, and this will remain true whether it be one which is rapidly drawing to its close or one of which we are still only in the middle. Which-ever be the case, it is likely that the German Centre party, born in a great crisis of the German talent for organization, will prove to have been the most important of these political groups. Its history falls into three parts; the first is from the foundation of the Empire to the close of the *Kulturkampf*, the second from this to the fall of the Empire in 1918, and the third from the establishment of the Weimar Republic to 1933. In the earliest of these periods the history of the party is identical with that of Ludwig Windthorst, its leader, though not actually its founder, one of the most influential political figures in modern Germany, and perhaps the greatest debater the Reichstag ever saw.

Windthorst's life of four score years coincided almost exactly with an epoch in the life of his nation. For he was born in 1812, the year before the national uprising against Napoleon, and died in 1891, just twelve months after Bismarck's fall. The future Catholic leader came of a family of legal traditions, and was born at Kaldenhof, near Osnabrück, in the flat, scenically uninteresting, and mainly Protestant plain of North-West Germany. Ludwig was sent to school at the Carolinium in Osnabrück, an ancient educational institution which owed its foundation to Charlemagne. Sprung from a pious stock, the lad pondered for some time on the thought of becoming a priest, but eventually decided to dedicate himself to the legal profession. He studied at Göttingen and Heidelberg, qualifying as an advocate when twenty-four. Soon after he married and had three children, of whom one survived him. After practising in Osnabrück he obtained, in 1848, a post on the Supreme Court of Appeal of the Kingdom of Hanover which sat in Celle.

The revolutionary movement which swept over Europe during the same year opened up to Windthorst the possibility of a political career, and he was soon sitting as deputy for his

native city in the second Chamber of the Hanoverian parliament. He was elected president of the House, and in 1851 was appointed Minister of Justice. Never before in the Kingdom had a Catholic attained ministerial rank. Windthorst was able to render a valuable service to his fellow Catholics in this capacity by being instrumental in bringing about the re-establishment of the Catholic see of Osnabrück. Meeting, however, with strong dislike from Count Borries, the Minister of the Interior, he was not long afterwards compelled to relinquish his portfolio and driven into comparative retirement for nine years. For a time he contributed to a Catholic newspaper in Cologne, but was looked on with suspicion in his own state, being supposed, apparently without ground, to hold anti-monarchical opinions. He was even under police surveillance when in the capital. But the cloud lifted and he was back in office from 1862 to 1865, when he resigned on account of his failure to get the blind monarch, a firm believer in the divine right of kings, to consent to a measure extending the suffrage.

We now are within a year of the catastrophe in which the Kingdom of Hanover disappeared from the map of Europe, and Windthorst was made a subject of the King of Prussia; and was so led to become an actor on the political stage of the new German Empire instead of on that of a petty kingdom. Hanover, a conservative state, was in bad odour with the German Liberals, who looked hopefully towards Prussia. They did not look in vain; for from the Prussian point of view its existence was something of an anomaly, since it formed a wedge cutting Prussia in two by separating Westphalia and the Rhineland from the older provinces. The crisis, which had long been maturing in Germany, came to a head in 1866, and when war broke out between Prussia and Austria, Hanover sided with the latter, and was soon overrun by Prussian troops, King George being driven into exile. These events marked the turning-point in Windthorst's career. Many Hanoverians remained loyal to the fallen dynasty and became known as "Guelphs". Windthorst, though remaining on friendly terms with the ex-king, and indeed conducting negotiations between him and the Prussian Government in connexion with the family

estates of the exiled dynasty, took the oath of allegiance to the King of Prussia. This enabled him to enter the Parliament of the North German Confederation, in which he sat as deputy for Meppen. Windthorst belonged to the *Grossdeutschen* or Great German party. This party advocated a united Germany which should include Austria, and was opposed by the *Kleindeutschen* party whose adherents advocated the exclusion of Austria from Germany. Never a popular orator, capable of swaying the emotions of the crowd, the future leader of the Centre party found in the North German Diet a scope for the display of his powers as a debater and his mastery of parliamentary tactics. The great religious crisis, his connexion with which made him a national figure, did not, however, develop till after the war with France. Indeed, the first results of Prussia's aggrandisement were to benefit the Catholic Church. For the Constitution of 1850 was particularly liberal in its ecclesiastical provisions. It proclaimed the right of the Catholic Church, no less than of the Evangelical one, to administer its own affairs, and laid down that intercourse between religious associations and their superiors should be unimpeded. The peaceful relations between Church and State in Prussia were maintained for twenty years. When they came to an end the Catholics seem to have been taken by surprise. The establishment of the new German Empire in 1871 might appear in a sense a triumph for Protestantism; since for the first time a state predominantly Protestant was militarily the strongest power on the Continent. This did not, however, in itself, forebode ill for the German Catholics, and during the winter of 1870-1 they were even entertaining the hopes that German intervention might be employed to restore to the Pope his lost temporal possessions.

The long and embittered struggle of the ensuing years has gone down to history under the name of the *Kulturkampf*, an epithet coined by the anthropologist, Rudolf Virchow, to propagate the view that the issue at stake was the preservation of European civilization against the assaults of what its opponents called "Ultramontanism". We must not, however, misconceive the nature of the conflict. To attribute it to "Prussianism", as is often done, is to take but a one-sided view of it. The driving power behind it was not so much Prussianism as free-thinking

Liberalism, though the Liberals were able to turn to their own advantage the anti-Polish sentiments of the Prussian Government. The Liberals professed to see in the definition of papal infallibility a challenge thrown down by the Church of Rome to modern civilization, and their answer was an attempt to detach the Catholics of Germany from their allegiance to the Holy See. The leaders of the Old Catholic movement encouraged the view that the Papacy was the enemy of progress, and the Liberals in their turn gave their support to the Old Catholics. To work up German popular national feeling against the Vatican a story was circulated that the war against France had been brought about by Pius IX exerting influence on the Empress Eugénie. The ground was thus carefully prepared for an anti-Catholic campaign, and the Liberals and the Old Catholics knew well how to turn to their account Bismarck's fear of the encroachment of the Slav on the Germanic elements in Prussia's eastern provinces. In fact the Iron Chancellor, after his fall, declared that for him the *Kulturkampf* was always primarily an anti-Polish rather than an anti-Catholic measure. The pretext for the quarrel with the Holy See was the Pope's refusal to receive Cardinal Hohenlohe as German ambassador. Pius IX was, of course, within his rights in so doing, but Bismarck, egged on by the Old Catholics and the Liberals, had already determined on war. "We are not going to Canossa," he exclaimed. A further pretext was provided by some correspondence between Windthorst and a canon of Posen named Kozmian which was seized by the police, though it contained nothing treasonable and merely concerned the schools question.

The aim of the Chancellor and of those who abetted him, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say used him, was nothing less than ultimately to detach the greater number of the Catholics of Germany from allegiance to Rome, an end to be reached by reducing the Church to a department of the state.¹ A programme of ecclesiastical legislation designed for this end was drawn up and laid before the Prussian Landtag by the new minister of worship, Dr Paul Ludwig Adalbert Falk. The Catholic division in the ministry, which had been

¹ The suggestion was made to Cardinal Hohenlohe that he should become primate of a German National Church.

founded by Frederick William IV, was suppressed, the excuse for this step being that it was becoming a focus of Polish agitation. The Falk laws, four in number, were laid before the Landtag in November 1872 and January 1873. These measures provided for a court composed of government officials to be called the "Royal Court of Justice for Ecclesiastical Affairs", which body was to be a court of appeal from all the ecclesiastical courts of Prussia. Only Germans were to be eligible to ecclesiastical offices. No one might be ordained priest who had not been educated in a German gymnasium or university and passed a state examination in philosophy, history, German literature and the classics. Junior seminaries were suppressed and others declared to be under Government control. By another law ecclesiastical appointments were to be notified to the provincial government and could be vetoed if it said that they were calculated to endanger public tranquillity. The procedure to be followed by persons desirous of leaving the Catholic Church was also facilitated, while strong official encouragement was given to the Old Catholic schism, the Government maintaining in their posts priests who had been suspended by their Bishops. These measures were promulgated in May 1873, and became known as the "May Laws". Since the Commission of the Landtag, to which they had been referred, called attention to the fact that these laws violated those clauses of the Constitution of 1850 conceding to the Catholic Church the right of managing her own affairs, the Constitution was amended so as to admit of the passage of the new legislation. The Government, confident of success, resolved to enforce the new legislation with rigour. Its method of procedure, a clumsy one, was to arrest the Bishops. Within a year of the promulgation of the May Laws six members of the Prussian hierarchy were in prison. The first to be arrested was Ledochowski, Archbishop of Posen and Gnesen, who refused to comply with an order that religious instruction should be given in German. He was arrested between 3 and 4 a.m. on 3 February, 1874, and placed in a military prison at Ostrowo. On 13 March he was created a Cardinal. Archbishop Melchers of Cologne suffered an incarceration of six months and on his release received a certificate of good behaviour. A few German Catholics, both clerical and lay, supported the Govern-

ment, and were known as State Catholics or *Staatskatholiken*. Prominent among them was Cardinal Hohenlohe's brother, the Duke of Ratibor. Bismarck further aggravated the situation by introducing changes into the oath of allegiance, taken by the Bishops of Prussia to the King on their appointment, by which reference to their canonical oath of allegiance to the Pope was omitted, and they were required to swear unconditional obedience to the laws of the state both present and future. On 22 April, 1874, the Landtag passed a new law, the *Sperrgesetz*, by which the salaries of the Bishops were suspended till they complied with the May Laws. In 1874 May was again a black month for the Catholics of Prussia, for on its last day a yet further law was passed expelling all religious communities except those engaged in the care of the sick. The Jesuits and the Redemptorists had been previously expelled. Civil marriage was extended to the whole German Empire in 1875 and not long afterwards made obligatory, the right of keeping marriage registers being taken away from the clergy. Seven years after the beginning of the *Kulturkampf* more than a thousand parish priests had been prosecuted, as well as six hundred of their assistants. Though the Falk laws were peculiar to Prussia similar legislation was introduced into most of the other federal states. Even in Bavaria the Government actively supported the Old Catholic schism. At one time Württemberg and Oldenburg were the only, or almost only, parts of Germany in which tranquil relations existed between the Church and the civil power.

In the prosecution of his anti-clerical campaign Bismarck's main support came from the Liberals. The Conservatives were divided, some of the more old-fashioned Lutherans being opposed to the *Kulturkampf*, fearing that harm to religion would result from state control over the churches. At Court the *Kulturkampf* was not well viewed, the Emperor William I being lukewarm, and the Empress Augusta actively hostile to it. Its ultimate failure was due to a variety of causes, the exaggerated idea of the strength of the Old Catholic movement entertained by Bismarck and the National Liberals; the new problems created by the rise of Social Democracy; more positively by the activity of the Catholic Parliamentary opposition, and so far as it could be ascribed to one man, to Windthorst.

From 1859 to 1863 there had existed in the Prussian Diet a small Catholic party known as the Centre from the part of the Chamber in which it sat. At the elections held in the latter year this party disappeared and there seemed no need for its revival, so satisfactory were the relations existing between Church and State. Suddenly, in 1869, a tranquil sky became overclouded. A canard gained credence that a nun had been imprisoned and was being ill-treated in a convent at Cracow, and swiftly hostile manifestations against the religious orders sprang up as if by magic in various parts of Germany. These led to the reconstitution of the Prussian Centre as a measure of self-protection. The moving spirits in the taking of this step were Peter Reichen-sperger and Hermann von Mallinckrodt, two members of the former Centre, and Ludwig Windthorst, who had hitherto been classed as a "federalist". The new Centre in the Prussian Diet was the parent of the Centre in the Imperial Reichstag which took the place of the former North German Parliament in 1871. Its object was "to protect the liberty of the Church and preserve the confessional primary school". It counted some sixty members.

Windthorst, though one of its promoters, did not at first join it owing to his connexion with the ex-king of Hanover. He was sixty years old when he began the great struggle in which he was to vanquish the foremost statesman in Europe and regain for the Catholics of Germany most of their threatened liberties. In appearance somewhat unprepossessing and with a large head with searching eyes poised on a frail body, he was an easy model for the caricaturist. His short stature, a contrast to Bismarck's commanding height, earned for Windthorst the sobriquet of *die kleine Excellenz* (the little Excellency). His manner was simple and homely; he spoke slowly, and excelled as a debater rather than as a parliamentary orator, but his speeches, full of caustic humour, always compelled the attention of his hearers. Conscious of the formidable character of the antagonist with whom they had to deal, Bismarck's supporters in the Press sought to undermine Windthorst's authority with his followers by insinuating that he was at heart an unbeliever who feigned belief in Christianity for the purpose of advancing his parliamentary career, an insinuation entirely without foundation. Like many

other German Catholics Windthorst had before the Vatican Council been an inopportunist, that is to say had hoped that Papal Infallibility would not be proclaimed a dogma of the Church. But he had never any sympathy with the Old Catholic schism, and throughout his long life was a practising Catholic of simple unostentatious piety. The leader of the Centre was not, however, "clericalist" in the narrow sense of the term, and would on occasion act against the wishes both of the Pope and of the Hierarchy.

The younger generation of English Catholics which can remember no Germany older than the Weimar Republic, and perhaps none older than the Third Reich, may find it difficult to visualize the Germany of the Second or Hohenzollern Reich, a curious combination of elements drawn from two different ages. The old Germany of the days before the French Revolution was represented by the Kings, Grand-dukes, Dukes, Princes and Free Cities and the new Europe by the parliamentary machinery of the Reichstag. The Germany of William I and Bismarck was neither a constitutional monarchy like England nor an autocracy like Russia, but something halfway between the two. On such a stage the duel between Bismarck and Windthorst was fought out. Its theatre was the Reichstag and it was a parliamentary duel from first to last. There was never any question of Bismarck sending his adversary to a concentration camp, nor of Windthorst attempting to overthrow the Chancellor by a *coup d'état* or remove him from the scene by means of hired assassins. We cannot imagine him receiving Holy Communion just before making an attempt on Bismarck's life.

Mallinckrodt died in 1874 and Windthorst succeeded him in the leadership of the Centre which had just fought successful elections, both for the Landtag and the Reichstag. Windthorst held the leadership of the party till his death in 1891, but the great religious struggle to which he devoted his energies was over four years earlier. "You wish for war, you shall have it," said Windthorst to Bismarck in the Reichstag, and the Bismarckian Press accused him of seeking to stir up civil strife, though the Catholic deputy, Schorlemer-Alst, explained that it was of parliamentary war that he was speaking. Had it not been for the councils of moderation which he was constantly urging on his

co-religionists that struggle might have led to civil war. One painful incident did occur; a Catholic youth named Kullmann made an attempt on Bismarck's life at Bad-Kissingen on 13 July, 1874, and led the Chancellor to declare that the would-be assassin "hung on to the coat tails" of the Centre. One scurrilous journal published a cartoon depicting Windthorst and Kullmann as Siamese twins.

The resistance of the Catholics to the persecution was almost invariably displayed in an exemplary spirit, being confined to peaceable channels. One of its features was a great outburst of journalistic activity, the Catholic papers rapidly increasing in number from six to a hundred and twenty. Over the meetings which the Catholics held during these years Windthorst reigned like an uncrowned king. He occupied a chair apart and his voice would always be listened to and applauded even when the closure of the discussion had been voted. His enemies in the Press, having failed to convince the world that he was at heart an unbeliever, now accused him of being guided solely by motives of personal ambition and of exploiting the religious question to serve it.

Like all, or nearly all, foreigners, however, Windthorst failed to understand England, and there was a certain *naïveté* in his action when, in 1877, he sounded the British Ambassador in Berlin, Lord Odo Russell, as to his willingness to propose amicably to Bismarck that the German Catholics should be treated as the English ones were under the Emancipation Laws. Such intervention by the ambassador was of course out of the question, and he replied by advising the Centre party to remain on the defensive and to mitigate, if not actually to discontinue, attacks on the Government and especially on Bismarck. But the turning-point in the struggle was already drawing near. A new phenomenon was making its appearance in German politics, the Social Democratic party. Despite his fortuitous alliance with the Liberals Bismarck belonged to the old order and was deeply perturbed by this development. Even more disquieting symptoms of unrest manifested themselves when two attempts were made on the Emperor's life, in the first of which he was wounded. The desirability of extricating himself from the position of hostility towards the Catholics in which he had

become involved was now clear to Bismarck. But another reason, also, made this step appear desirable: he was anxious to obtain the support of the Centre for the policy of a protective tariff to which he had become a convert. On 3 December, 1878, Windthorst in the Landtag demanded the restoration of articles 15, 16 and 18 of the Prussian Constitution which guaranteed to the Catholic Church the right to self-government; eight days later he called for the repeal of the law against the religious orders, and in the New Year raised the question of the schools. The animated debates which these questions led to fortified Bismarck in the view that the Centre was a force of which he might one day need the support in the coming struggle with Social Democracy. For him the dominant issue of the *Kulturkampf* was a Polish one; he had had no desire to be drawn into conflict with the German Catholics as a whole, and was already beginning to doubt the wisdom of the policy of Falk which conjured up a picture of "dexterous, light-footed priests pursued through back-doors and bedrooms by honest but awkward Prussian gendarmes with spurs and trailing sabres". The moment seemed propitious for a change of policy. Pius IX who had condemned the May Laws had died on 7 February, 1878, and had been succeeded by Leo XIII. The new Pope wrote a conciliatory letter to the Emperor urging the repeal of the persecuting laws. William's reply was frigid, but the Pope wrote a second letter and received a more promising reply from the Crown Prince, who was then acting as regent while his father was recovering from the wounds received when his life had been attempted. In July 1879 Bismarck took an important step in the direction of conciliation. He dismissed Falk and appointed to succeed him Robert von Puttkammer, a Conservative, who as *Oberpräsident* of Silesia had been conspicuous for the leniency with which he had enforced the May Laws. During the same year the Centre party lent its support to Bismarck's tariff policy, but soon afterwards showed that he could not always rely on it by voting against the "Septennat" or law fixing the peace strength of the army for a period of seven years. In 1880 the Chancellor began negotiations with the Holy See through the intermediary of the Prince of Reuss, German Ambassador in Vienna. His fear of Windthorst was in no way abated

and he tried to persuade Leo XIII to get the Centre to drop its leader and become a docile tool in the hands of the Government, a thing which the Pope probably lacked both the power and the will to do. At the next Reichstag elections the Centre still further increased its representation, numbering ninety-eight seats, which, joined to those of the Poles, Guelphs and Alsatians, gave it a commanding position. There was no possibility of an immediate settlement, but diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the Court of Berlin were resumed and a *modus vivendi* was reached by which vacant sees and parishes were filled. Windthorst, now seventy years of age but with energy unabated, had to continue his campaign, on behalf of the Catholics of Germany, both in and out of Parliament for a few years longer till the *Kulturkampf* was formally closed by the laws of 1886 and 1887. By the former the *Kultur Examen* required of candidates for the priesthood was abolished and by the latter papal disciplinary authority over the clergy was restored. The Pope yielded on the question of the notification to the provincial governments of the appointments of parish priests. The settlement was of the nature of a compromise; the clauses of the Prussian Constitution which had been suppressed in 1873 were not restored, and the law expelling the Jesuits and the Redemptorists remained unrepealed.

Windthorst, who had had the largest share in bringing about the reversal of the May Laws, was not altogether satisfied with the result. He would have liked to continue the struggle to the point of regaining for the Church in Prussia the position it held in 1870. But Leo XIII favoured a compromise. He had hopes that the German Government might be led to use its influence for the purpose of securing a favourable settlement of the Roman Question. He had fears, moreover, of a European war and entertained the idea of mediation between France and Germany over the question of Alsace-Lorraine after his successful mediation between Germany and Spain in the dispute over the Caroline Islands. The Vatican therefore had no wish to humiliate Bismarck. But Windthorst for his part was no less ready to take a line independent of the Vatican if he felt the situation to be such as to call for it. On his advice the Centre party refused to vote for the renewal of the "Septennat" when urged to do so by

Leo XIII; and when the Vatican envoy, Mgr Galimberti, spoke of the perilous position in which the Sovereign Pontiff might find himself in the event of a European war, he replied that in such an eventuality the Pope and his Cardinals must be ready to die at their posts. But Leo had a high regard for the Catholic leader, said that he constantly prayed for him, and finding that he had a nephew who was a priest made him a monsignore.

The last chapter in the relations between Bismarck and his old antagonist was ironical. William I died on 9 March, 1888, to be followed to the grave ninety-nine days later by his only son. The twenty-nine-year-old William II now succeeded to the Prussian and Imperial crowns, and within less than two years dismissed his grandfather's great minister. Only a week before this event Bismarck had asked Windthorst to visit him at the Chancellery as the Centre held the balance in the new Reichstag and the Chancellor wished to negotiate for its support. Those conversant with the inner history of the politics of the period are assured that this interview was one of the causes which precipitated Bismarck's fall.

Windthorst's last service to the Church in Germany, performed a few months before his death, was the foundation of the *Volksverein* or "People's Union", an organization devoted to the defence of Christian social principles. He drafted its constitution and, though in failing health, attended the meeting in Cologne at which the union was inaugurated on 24 October, 1890. On 14 March following Windthorst died at his modest residence in the Jakobstrasse in Berlin a few weeks after entering on his eightieth year. Tributes were paid to his memory in both houses of the imperial parliament. The Kaiser sent a wreath and nearly all the reigning houses of Germany were represented at his funeral. After a requiem in St Hedwig's Church, at which the celebrant was Mgr Kopp, Bishop of Fulda,¹ the funeral procession passed through the famous Brandenburg Gate which by special order from the Emperor was opened for it, an honour hitherto reserved for Prussian princes. The interment took place at the Marienkirche in Hanover, which had been built with

¹ Afterwards Prince-Bishop of Breslau and Cardinal; Kopp was the foremost German Catholic bishop of William II's reign.

funds subscribed as a testimonial to the deceased leader.¹ "By his death," said *The Times*, "the Reichstag loses its most popular and original figure, and the Church of Rome its doughtiest champion in Germany." It has been remarked that as fate decreed that Windthorst should always be in opposition, he had no opportunity of displaying his abilities as an administrator. So far as one can judge they would probably have been not inconsiderable. The Centre party lasted for forty years after Windthorst's death and office came to it at last, but in days that were dark. Georg von Hertling, its leader, was called to the Chancellorship a year before the Empire fell and it had its share of the fruits of office in the years following the first world war. But, whatever the weaknesses and errors of its later days, it had a large share in making the reign of William II the greatest epoch in the history of the Church in modern Germany, an achievement which would have been impossible without Windthorst.

HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON

THE VICARS APOSTOLIC OF ENGLAND

I. THE DARKEST HOUR

THE fact that one hundred years ago it was definitely decided in Rome to restore the Hierarchy in England, after a lapse of nearly 300 years, and that next year we shall be celebrating with joy the centenary of the actual achievement of that Restoration, turns the mind naturally to those courageous, laborious, and often heroic men who, as Vicars Apostolic, preceded the coming of the Hierarchy and ruled the Church in England from 1623 till 1850. With the exception of the period 1631-85, during which there was no Vicar-Apostolic in England, these devoted men guided the English Catholics through the

¹ The Catholics of Germany dedicated many a church to St Louis as a tribute of affection to the memory of their lost leader.

perilous years of the penal times, when the faithful were but a handful, and one seemingly doomed to extinction, when all but hope was well-nigh dead, when oppression, imprisonment, and death itself were the lot of Catholics, and when only a burning faith and an overwhelming love of God and of His Church could sustain them to maintain the apparently unequal battle generation after generation, until in God's good time the dawn at last broke and the fruits of their unremitting and fearless labours were safely handed on to descendants who, but for them, would probably never have known the Faith at all.

As Vicars Apostolic, these prelates were Bishops without being "Ordinaries" in the technical sense, i.e. they were merely Delegates of the Pope with limited faculties revocable at the will of the Holy See, and not possessing Cathedrals, Chapters, and the rest of the diocesan machinery with which we are familiar today. Hence they were invariably named Bishops of sees which were in *partibus infidelium*, instead of bearing the name of the district over which each ruled. Thus they lacked something of the position and stability of an "Ordinary", and this fact considerably weakened them, and gave rise to incessant controversies amongst both clergy and laity throughout the seventeenth and a great part of the eighteenth centuries, as well as increasing the dissensions which persisted between the secular and the regular clergy, since the extent of their jurisdiction was called in question. Of this more will be said later.

In sketching briefly the story of the gradual development of the Vicariates in this country, and glancing at some of the men who ruled over them, it is necessary first to see something of the position of affairs before their coming, if their difficulties (and dangers) are to be appreciated. Midway through the reign of Elizabeth the last Catholic Bishop still left in England (Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln) died in prison in 1584. This left only Bishop Goldwell of St Asaph who was in exile in Rome, and he died the following year, so that the whole English Catholic Hierarchy became extinct. Fortunately at this juncture there was one man who towered head and shoulders above his fellows, William Cardinal Allen (1532-94), and it is generally admitted that it was chiefly by him that the remnants of Catholicism in England were saved. It would be beside our purpose

to dwell here upon his career, which is in any case so well known, but mention should be made of his founding of the English Seminary at Douay in 1572. and of the English College in Rome, and his success seven years later in persuading the Pope to send the Jesuits into England, three events which had a vital bearing on our subject. It is thus not surprising that he was appointed "Prefect of the English Mission" by Pope Gregory XIII on 18 September, 1581. Six years later he was created Cardinal, and became amongst other things Vatican Librarian, and thus incidentally a forerunner of Cardinal Gasquet.

Cardinal Allen was recognized as the head of the secular clergy in England, and no man did more than he not only to keep alive the feeble embers of the Faith in this land, but also to provide for the future by ensuring a supply of missionary priests from overseas. There was little that could actually be done in England itself, for episcopal authority did not exist, as some forty years had elapsed since there had been a Bishop in the country; and moreover the conditions under which the scattered Catholics lived made any improvement of their lot extremely difficult. A sidelight on those conditions is provided by an interesting document¹ which vividly describes the state of affairs in one corner of the Kingdom, but which might apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to almost any part of the country at the time. It is a report from Robert Bennet, the Protestant Bishop of Hereford, to the Earl of Salisbury, and is dated 22 June, 1605:

"... Upon Wednesday evening last, being the 19th June, Sir James Scudamore, with Mr Ruddhall, Mr Rowland Vaughan, and Mr Kirle, Justices of the Peace, with such aid as I could give them, went into the Darren (in the parish of Garway, Herefordshire, on the border of Monmouthshire) and places near adjoining to make search and apprehend Jesuits and Priests, their abettors and receivers, certain days before being riotously abroad with weapons, and did make diligent search all that night, and day following, from village to village, from house to house, about thirty miles compass, near the confines of Monmouthshire, where they found houses full of altars, images, books of superstition, reliques of idolatry, but left desolate of men and

¹ *Cath. Rec. Soc.*, Vol. II, p. 289. The spelling is here modernized.

women, except here and there an aged woman or a child, all were fled into Wales, and but one man apprehended, out of whose examination nothing worthy of relation can be got; all that circuit of rude and barbarous people carried headlong into these desperate courses by Priests (whereof there is great store) and principal gentlemen, Lords of Towns and manors there; who lead the rest at will. But our purpose was descried, and made vain, except (for) a terror stricken into them. And therefore some other course must be taken. For if we go out with few, we shall be beaten home; if we levy our strength, we are descried, and they are all fled into woods, and there they will lurk until the assizes be past. Therefore not I, but all the rest are of opinion, that a proclamation must call them in by a day prefixed to yield themselves to his Majesty's either justice or mercy. I have also sent enclosed two several examinations concerning the riot committed at the first going out of the Justices; which will yield some matter of further discover, wherein are detected many principal actors, and all (are) dangerous men. . . . And all these are fled their houses into corners, and presently cannot be apprehended. . . . Further it is discovered unto me, which I dare not conceal, that Sir Charles Morgan (one of the above) at the late Queen's death, was solicited to rise up in arms. It is said in his commendation that he refused, yet were it expedient he were sounded, by whom. I am told out of question it was by William Morgan, John Smith, and one North, a Priest. It is also insinuated that Cadwallader the Priest¹ and William Morgan were actors and had their finger in the late Watson's² intended treason, which was in part hammered here in these parts. . . ."

There then follow lists of people "detected to have been present" at respectively a funeral, a forcible rescue of arrested men, an assembly armed to resist the Sheriff, and at Mass at various places, and finally a long list of the chief recusants of Herefordshire. Typical of these is the following somewhat pathetic list:

"The names of ye persons armed att the Darren, and assembled to resist the Bishopp and Sheriffe, whom they heard were coming: Richard Davies with a Javelinge. James, Mr Vaughan's Shephard, with a forest bill and a longe hanger. John Phillips

¹ Ven. Roger Cadwallader, martyred at Leominster, 27 August, 1610.

² Richard Griffiths, *alias* Watson, S.J.

of Broad Oak with a pike. William Hughes of Monmouth with bowe and Arrowes. Mr Vaughan's men of Llantorhall had all weapons."

Those were stirring times, and if the Catholics were few they were at least sturdy and ready to defend the Faith, even though it be only with a "Javeling" or a bow and arrows. But of course such a state of affairs meant the eventual extinction of the Faith in this island unless real reorganization were taken in hand, and with the death of Cardinal Allen on 16 October, 1594, the problem had to be squarely faced, though it was by no means an easy one to solve. There were several reasons why the Holy See at this time (as also for more than two hundred years to come) was unwilling to appoint an "Ordinary" Bishop. Amongst them was her desire not to give unnecessary offence to the English Government, whilst she was also deterred from taking such a step by the strong and sustained opposition of the Regulars to having a Bishop of any sort (even a Vicar Apostolic) as they feared that the arrival of any Bishop would not only intensify the persecution which the Catholics were undergoing, but would also lead to confusion and dissension over such matters as the extent of his jurisdiction and the granting of faculties. However, after a delay of four years, a compromise was found in the appointment in 1598 of an "Archpriest" with ample faculties, but without the prestige or authority of a Bishop, and George Blackwell, a convert priest, was appointed.

Unfortunately it was not a happy choice, for Blackwell had neither the tact nor the steadiness necessary in his very delicate position, while his harshness, for which he was rebuked by Rome, soon caused him many troubles with his clergy. The result was the famous "Archpriest Controversy" which so disturbed Catholic life in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, and in which both clergy and laity took sides. The chief causes of dissension were the two problems which disturbed English Catholic life for the best part of two centuries: the Oath of Allegiance to the Crown (which contained a denial of the Papal claim to the deposing power), and the question of the jurisdiction of the Archpriests, and later of the Vicars Apostolic, over the regulars. As regards the first of these, Blackwell opposed the

oath of allegiance to Queen Elizabeth, which was favoured by those of the clergy who, having appealed against the appointment of an Archpriest, came to be called the "Appellants", so that these last were a constant thorn in his side, and frequently appealed to Rome against him. But later he inconsistently supported the oath that was demanded by James I, though this only slightly modified the earlier oath. This action on his part caused further trouble, for this oath was condemned by Pope Paul V in 1606. But Blackwell had by this time joined himself to his former opponents, the Appellants, and refused to publish the Papal Brief, declaring moreover that the Pope had no power to deprive the King of his realm. None the less he was arrested by the Government and imprisoned, and in prison he took the unlawful oath, while at the same time he rejected a letter from Cardinal Bellarmine (written on behalf of the Holy See), as well as a further Brief from the Holy Father himself, and handed both of these documents to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Eventually in 1608 he was deprived of office and of his faculties by the Holy See, and George Birkhead was appointed in his place. On the twin problem of jurisdiction Blackwell had been equally unhappy, for from the start it was widely believed that his faculties contained a secret clause which made him subservient to the Jesuit Superior, and this caused widespread discontent amongst the secular clergy. The appointment of an Archpriest did nothing to settle this thorny problem or to soothe the differences between the seculars and regulars.

With the arrival of Birkhead as Archpriest matters began slightly to improve, largely because he was of a "peaceable and reconciling temper". In his letters of appointment from Pope Paul V he was instructed to dissuade Catholics from taking the oath of allegiance and also to endeavour to keep them from attending Protestant worship, in which matters he was as successful as might reasonably be expected. Inevitably he found himself in controversy with Fr Persons, the famous and formidable English Jesuit leader, for at this time there was a possibility of the English College at Douay coming under the control of the Jesuits, as its head, Dr Worthington, was desirous of bringing this about, to the great dismay of the secular clergy; but in all such matters Dr Birkhead was gentle and conciliatory,

though none the less firm, and in the end the threatened transfer of the control of the College did not take place. But this affair confirmed him in his own long-standing opinion that it was highly desirable that there should be a Bishop at the head of the Church in England, and he sent a petition to Rome to this effect. Like many preceding petitions on the same subject, however, it remained without effect, and when Birkhead himself died in 1614, after ruling only six years, a third Archpriest was appointed.

William Harrison, the third and last of the Archpriests, was a man of different type, being more forthright and forcible in character. Educated at Douay and at the English College in Rome, he later studied Canon Law in Paris and then became a Professor first at Rheims and then at Douay. In 1615 he was appointed to succeed Dr Birkhead as Archpriest, and he, too, at once found himself in difficulties over the status of Douay and its relations with the Society of Jesus. But he was determined to raise the standing of the secular clergy and therefore to strengthen them against the influence of the regulars, and with this object in view he succeeded after a long struggle in bringing about the removal of the Jesuit confessor from the College at Douay and caused the students to cease attending the Jesuit classes in the town. For the same reason he was, like his predecessor, a strong supporter of the plan for having a Bishop in England, and shortly before his death he sent a mission to Rome to press for such an appointment. Before anything was decided he himself died on 11 May, 1621, after six years' rule, and thereupon the whole question was reconsidered by the Holy See. In truth it was by now plain that the "Archpriest plan" had not been a success, and that someone with more authority and dignity was required in England to deal with the very difficult situation there. But Rome still believed that it was inexpedient to send thither a Bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, and it was in these circumstances that it was at last decided that a Bishop with a *see in partibus infidelium* should be appointed. The era of the Vicars Apostolic had begun, and the stage was set for the entry of new figures of a rank and standing hitherto unknown in English history.

BASIL HEMPHILL, O.S.B.

CAROL

'Neath clouds, dawn-dappled, towards Bethlehem
A Queen went sandalled and grace was her gem.

Pale-glinted the stars. Rich-laden with Child
Glad-weary She trudged, by Joseph's lamp mild.

Log-blazes out-wavered on the Twain poor,
But cold hearts within sharp-shut the door.

A cave-byre beckoned that nigh-Mother sweet;
An ox and an ass that Virgin did greet.

Came He as the dew upon April's grass
But kinder than dew, that quickly must pass.

Low bended the shepherds, with firstling and crook,
Spelled by the Babe and His meek Mother's look.

Caravans halted and dread kings adored
Their newly-born Liege and increate Lord.

* * *

Centuries reel. By the Crib I may bend
Shall I bolt the heart's door on that uttermost Friend?

O Spurn Him not nor His fair Mother grieve
But, prostrate, adore and, stalwart, believe.

A servitor-star those monarchs obey:
Shall our rulers reject the star-Maker's sway?

Mother, be swift! Plead thy Babe's divine Light
Like lance of the sunrise, scatter Earth's night.

* * *

Bank still the war-clouds? From Bethlehem's Cave
A Queen, like an army, hastens to save.

FREDERICK DUCKETT

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

HOLY SCRIPTURE

IN a discerning and highly critical review of the St Matthew volume of the Oxford *Novum Testamentum Graece* that excellent scholar, Professor T. W. Manson of Manchester, criticized the editorial committee's decision to print the text of the "sixty-year-old recension of Westcott and Hort" at the head of every page. "It is not irrelevant to point out," he writes, "that I already have three copies of this edition and could have more if I needed them."¹ A similar criticism, in this case concerned with the inclusion of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate text, might be offered to the editors of the otherwise admirable French series of Scripture commentaries that bear the general title: *La Sainte Bible: texte latin et traduction française avec un commentaire exégétique et théologique*, edited originally by the late Canon Pirot of the Lille faculty, and now, since Pirot's death in December, 1939, by the Abbé Albert Clamer of the *grand séminaire* of Nancy. This, by the way, is the seminary that has produced such eminent authorities as Vacant, Mangenot, Chevallier, and Mgr Amann (died 10 January, 1948), and, among the living, the existing President of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, His Eminence Cardinal Tisserant.² I may say, after the manner of Professor Manson, that, after parting with the editions by Hetzenauer and Fillion, I still have two complete editions of the Vulgate, not including the volumes already published of the critical texts prepared by the monks of the Abbaye de Saint-Jérôme for the Old Testament, and by Wordsworth and White for the New. Where space is so limited it seems entirely superfluous to print a Latin text that is *not* the basis of the French

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XLIII (1942), p. 87. Cf. also THE CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. XX, pp. 245-6. It may be remarked that a study of Manson's article has led me seriously to revise my erstwhile favourable opinion of the Oxford venture.

² Paris, Letouzey et Ané, various dates from 1935 to 1947. The price of the volumes now obtainable and in print was £5 10s. 6d. before the franc was devalued. These are II (Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy); VI (Sapiential Books); VII (Major prophets with Lamentations and Baruch); IX (SS Matthew and Mark); X (SS Luke and John); and XII (1 Thessalonians-Apocalypse).

translation and that can be fairly easily obtained by anybody who is interested in such matters.

It is difficult to characterize under one heading a number of volumes by a variety of authors, but it may be said that, within the limits of space allotted to them, the commentators have done well, in some cases very well. The volumes on the Gospels have already been before the public for a decade or more, and the names of the authors (Buzy for St Matthew; Pirot for St Mark; Marchal for St Luke; and Braun for St John) are in themselves a guarantee of careful, and usually accomplished, work. Perhaps the best of the four is Père François Braun's *S. Jean* which, while making full use (as all later commentators must) of Lagrange's great commentary, shows many signs of original thought and control. At the end of Volume X is a *Synopse évangélique d'après l'ordre chronologique* that follows, in the main, Lagrange's order, and gives paginal references to the volumes of the commentary. There are also tables of the Gospel passages used in the Church's liturgy, and an alphabetical index of the chief matters in our Lord's life and teaching. In each case the volume is dated 1946, but is, in effect, mainly a reimpression, in which the *Imprimatur* bears date of 4 October, 1934.

Of the remaining volumes, it may be sufficient to note that the best appears to be that on the Sapiential Books, in which nearly nine hundred pages are devoted to the five books concerned. Buzy is responsible for Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle; Renard for Proverbs; Spicq for Ecclesiasticus, and the present bishop of Strasbourg (Mgr Weber) for Wisdom. On the other hand, the least satisfactory is the volume on the Major Prophets, in which that veteran commentator, Canon Dennefeld of Strasbourg, has simply not been given the space to do justice to his vast programme, which includes, as might be expected, a certain amount of textual criticism. He himself is the first to recognize that a work on the Major Prophets, always an immense and difficult field of study, "est rendue particulièrement ardue par la nécessité de le faire tenir dans un cadre relativement restreint". It may be added that the print used for the notes, while perfectly clear, is smaller than that employed in the great *Dictionnaires*—and that, as all attentive readers would acknowledge, is certainly small enough!

A commentary of the kind just noticed is not intended to give detailed and lengthy excursions on the major problems of the books concerned. For these one must turn to fuller commentaries, or, whenever possible, to special monographs. One of the largest-sized problems, or at any rate subjects of debate, has been the identity of the Servant of Yahweh in Isaiah, and one of the most complete monographs on any Old Testament subject has just been published by the Oxford Press. It is Professor C. R. North's *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: an historical and critical study*, and it is of importance to realize that Professor North was originally brought up on the Collective theory, and has now been led by remorseless analysis and word-study to accept the individual and Messianic interpretation that is universal among Catholic scholars.¹ We all remember Bishop Dives in Mgr Knox's *Memories of the Future*, who declared: "We are going to abandon Truth, and go forward boldly, none knows whither." This would not be at all an adequate description of Professor North's quest, but he tells us that he set out on his present inquiry, not because he had ceased to be contented with the Collective theory, but simply because he had become interested in the subject, though he had no idea about the conclusions he was to reach. "The stage at which I disclose my own views corresponds roughly with the stage at which, in a preliminary reading of the most important works on the subject, I came to make up my mind" (p. iii).

The method of approach is partly historical and partly critical. In the historical section, there are chapters on Jewish interpretation of the Servant passages, on Christian interpretation to the eighteenth century, and then three chapters dealing respectively with Christian interpretation from Döderlein to Duhm, from Duhm to Mowinckel, and from Mowinckel to the present day. Some readers may feel that they would have preferred a complete synoptic treatment under each of the theories, so as to avoid three or more discussions of a theory at different stages of the book. In any case it would be useful to have a table of the type provided by Paul Volz in his *Jesaja II* in the *Kommentar zum Alten Testament* edited by Ernst Sellin.²

¹ Oxford University Press, 1948. Pp. viii + 247. Price 15s.

² Leipzig, 1932, p. 167. An English version with some additions may be found in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, XXIV, p. 223.

The critical section comprises four chapters on: the text and translation of the Songs, the Servant as depicted in the Songs, the authorship of the Songs, and, finally, a critical summary and conclusion. Nearly all the Hebrew words are given in transcription, presumably to avoid the heavy cost of setting Hebrew type. In a later edition it might be possible to print a corrected Hebrew text of the Songs as an appendix for the sake of those students (and they are many) who find that a transcribed text is more difficult to read than one in Semitic characters!

It is consoling that, after a thorough and entirely objective discussion of the various interpretations, the author reaches substantially the conclusion advocated by Catholic scholars, though they would certainly not adopt his explanation in terms of Dr C. C. J. Webb's "philosophical myth".

The long and detailed bibliography bears testimony to the author's amazing industry and his determination to leave no work of the smallest value unconsulted. In particular, his knowledge of the Catholic literature is extremely complete, the only striking omission that I have noted being the absence of any reference to the revised edition of the late Dom Höpfl's *Introductio specialis in Vetus Testamentum*. The elimination of so many theories once confidently held by scholars of renown recalls a remark in one of Somerset Maugham's books about various English authors who seemed so certain of immortality in his youth and now are virtually forgotten. Mention should be made of the clarity with which the theories are set out, and of the attractiveness of Professor North's style in regard to a subject in which dryasdusts are, unfortunately, only too common.

Two or three works on Hebrew lexicography and grammar may fittingly be noticed here. The first is the fifth edition of *A Concise English-Hebrew Dictionary*, edited by two of the greatest scholars of the day, Professor H. Danby, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, and Dr M. H. Segal of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, the author of the *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, published by the Oxford Press in 1927.¹ This is a valuable guide to the type of Hebrew now spoken by 700,000 Palestinian Jews, and is a far larger affair than Dr A. S. Waldstein's *Hebrew*

¹ Tel-Aviv, Dvir Publishing Company, 1927, pp. 462 + 260. Price £2 8s.

English Dictionary.¹ It will be of great assistance to those who are learning modern Hebrew by means of such works as Chaim Rabin's *Everyday Hebrew* or Menahem Naop's *Hebrew Language and Grammar*.² Its usefulness is increased by the *Concise Hebrew-English Dictionary, comprising the Hebrew of all ages*, a complementary work, bound up in the same volume, for which Dr Segal is alone responsible.

The need of a good Hebrew grammar, more serviceable for beginners than the well-known *Introductory Hebrew Grammar* by Davidson and McFadyen, has been appreciated for some time, and those who have had reason to deplore "the almost universal repugnance to the study of the language", mentioned so lugubriously by McFadyen in his preface, will be the first to welcome the recent reprint of Professor J. Weingreen's *Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew*.³ In his foreword Professor R. M. Gwynn writes of his colleague's work that "we have for many years past felt the need of a grammar written on the simplest possible lines, and yet enabling students to begin the actual study of the Old Testament without unnecessary delay". Any teacher of Hebrew who has used McFadyen's generally excellent book will remember those forty long pages on the principles of the syllable, the vowel-system and the tone, Dagesh, the gutturals, the quiescents and the accents, which so often served as an extinguisher to any faint and flickering love of the language that might have been already kindled. Professor Weingreen is able to reduce the pages before the treatment of the article to twenty, he has made use of a larger and clearer fount of Hebrew type, and his exercises are eminently encouraging and progressive. Even so, as has often been said, there is no royal road to the study of a Semitic language, and the Trollopean phrase has full applicability: "It's dogged as does it. It ain't thinking about it." The one serious complaint might be that something similar to the admirable *Key to the Exercises* in McFadyen's grammar is not, as yet, available for Weingreen's work. The *Key* was, in effect, a very thorough guide to the writing of the language.

JOHN M. T. BARTON

¹ Tel-Aviv, Mizpah Publishing Company, n.d. That delightful derivative of *kavash* (in the sense of *preserve* or *pickle*), i.e. *kevashîm*, is interpreted in the smaller work as "canned goods, mysterious things"!

² Published respectively by J. M. Dent and by Rubin Mass of Jerusalem.

³ Oxford, the Clarendon Press, 1948. Pp. xii + 316. Price 15s.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TABERNACLE KEY

A colleague maintains that the rule forbidding the key to be left on the altar between Masses is not obligatory, unless local law so directs, since it first appeared in a Roman Instruction which is left to the local Ordinaries to apply. Is this rule an obligation, even though the local Ordinary has not expressly ordered its observance? (P.)

REPLY

Canon 1269, §4: *Clavis tabernaculi, in quo sanctissimum Sacramentum asservatur, diligentissime custodiri debet, onerata graviter conscientia sacerdotis qui ecclesiae vel oratorii curam habet.*

S.C. Sacram., 26 May, 1938, n. 6, c.; *A.A.S.*, 1938, XXX, p. 203: *Ut huic diligentissimae custodiae canone praescriptae ab ecclesiae rectore satisfiat, ipsi districte praecipitur ut clavis tabernaculi nunquam super mensa altaris aut in claustro ostioli relinquantur, ne tempore quidem quo mane divina officia ad Sacramenti altare et Sanctissimae Communionis distributio peraguntur, praesertim si hoc altare haud in conspicuo sit.*

10, d. Hae sunt canonicae normae potioresque cautela, quas huic S. Congregationi visum est locorum Ordinariis praecipere ut vicissim parochis ceterisque SSmi Sacramenti custodibus pressius commendent executioni tradendas ad quoslibet convellendos abusos, si qui irreperint, et, quamvis desint, ad eosdem praecavendos: aliae, quae pro temporum et locorum adiunctis magis idoneae videantur ad eundem finem aptius attingendum, eorundem Pastorum zelo sollertique industriae relinquantur.

i. The meaning and force of Roman Instructions were discussed in this REVIEW, 1941, XXI, p. 357, and a full description in English of the Instruction given in 1938 on the tabernacle and key may be seen in the issue of 1938, XV, p. 170. It is true

that, in principle, these instructions are, for the most part, left to local Ordinaries to implement, and many bishops have done this, either by ordering the instruction to be observed¹ or by expressly directing that the tabernacle key is not to be left on the altar.² Occasionally, however, the wording of an Instruction makes it plain that some fresh rule is of obligation, even apart from episcopal directions. An important instance of this is the marriage *nihil obstat* in the Instruction *Sacrosanctum*, 29 June, 1941,³ which is enjoined with the word "praecipit".

ii. Whilst always loth to discover fresh obligations for the clergy, it is our opinion that the rule against leaving the tabernacle key on the altar between Masses or offices is of a similar character, and must be observed even though the local Ordinary has not enjoined it.

For, in the first place, it is really contained within the word "diligentissime" in canon 1269. Would a cashier entrusted with the key of a safe be keeping it with the greatest care if he left it lying about for any unauthorized person to use? All the legislation about the strength and fixity of a tabernacle becomes nugatory unless the key is most carefully kept, since it is easy for anyone to secure a wax impression. Sacrilegious robberies are frequent, and are sometimes due precisely to someone finding the key on the altar, as in the Italian case at Murcia in 1941.⁴

Moreover, the Instruction itself introduces this rule with the word "praecipitur", and modern writers on the subject record the obligation, taking for granted that it is now part of the common law.⁵

A canonical process of inquiry must take place whenever a sacrilegious robbery has occurred. Even the most careful precautions will not infallibly prevent these things happening, but the neglect of precautions explicitly required by the law would no doubt mean at least a severe reprimand for the person responsible. After being informed of the incident at Murcia, when the Blessed Sacrament was stolen and an empty ciborium left, the reply of the Sacred Congregation did not attach the

¹ *Lancaster Statutes*, 1945, n. 117.

² *Nottingham Statutes*, 1946, n. 53; *Northampton Statutes*, 1947, n. 71.

³ Cf. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1941, XXI, p. 198.

⁴ *Il Monitore*, 1942, p. 194; *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (Ius et Praxis), 1943, p. 8.

⁵ E.g. Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia Moralis* (1947), II, §172.

guilt of formal negligence to anyone, and was content with describing the practice of leaving the key on the altar as most imprudent, whilst directing the local Ordinary to warn the parish priest "gravissimis verbis" that he must carefully observe the terms of the Instruction in future.

"FIVE WOUNDS" ROSARY

Many of the faithful have in their possession leaflets containing a rosary devotion prohibited by the Holy Office in 1939. Must they be told to destroy them? If so, could we have the reasons for the prohibition, since the prayers contained therein seem quite orthodox and resemble others which are encouraged? (M.)

REPLY

S. Off., 12 December, 1939; *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1940, XVIII, p. 458: An devotionis forma vulgo. . . . *Rosario delle Santissime Piaghe di Nostro Signor Gesù Cristo* inter fideles fovere liceat? *Resp.* Em̃i et Reṽmi Patres DD. Cardinales . . . etiam prae oculis habito Decreto diei 26 Maii, 1937, "De novis cultus seu devotionis formis non introducendis deque inolitibus in re abusibus tollendis" respondendum decrevit: non licere.

Idem n.d. Apollinaris, 1940, p. 94, private: Vi decreti 1939 nihil damnatur quod in usu antiquo erat de cultu Sacris Vulneribus: sed ea tantum huius devotionis forma directe impetitur quae auspiciis M. Marthae Chambon vulgata est: . . . Quod vero attinet ad devotionem sub nomine Sororis Chambon vulgatam, ea non damnatur ut in se illicita, sed ex adiunctis iudicata est, praesertim quoad formam, non expedire ideoque non est fovenda.

i. That devotion to the Five Wounds as such is not touched by the above decree is quite certain. It is a mediaeval devotion much beloved by our forefathers in this country, as may be observed in the device used by the Pilgrimage of Grace and by Blessed Margaret Pole. There is a Mass and Feast under this title for the Friday of the third week in Lent "pro aliquibus

locis"; also, popular devotions in *Preces et Pia Opera*, nn. 168-173, indulgenced for all the faithful; and the Passionist Rosary of the Five Wounds is explained in Beringer, *Les Indulgences*, n. 879. The devotion is contained within prayers in constant use such as the *Anima Christi* and *En Ego*.

ii. The form of this devotion affected by the decree is the one connected with the revelations and visions of M. Martha Chambon, a religious of the Visitation Order who died in 1907. It is also known as "The Chaplet of Mercy". The prayers are devotionally orthodox and do not come within the prohibition of canon 1399, §5; they were approved and indulgenced by many local Ordinaries. The new devotions forbidden by the decree of 26 May, 1937,¹ were described as either "ridiculous" or "useless repetitions" of those already existing. The prayers at least of the "Chaplet of Mercy" are not ridiculous, but they do offend against the familiar ecclesiastical rule operating in many directions "ne bis de eodem". This alone, however, would hardly seem to be an adequate reason for the decree, and we should see, indeed, innumerable devotions and indulgenced prayers lying in ruins if the rule were rigidly applied. What the decree directly and expressly forbids is fostering (fovere) this devotion, namely by practising it in public or by printing and circulating leaflets which contain it. It might be advisable for the existing leaflets to be destroyed, and for persons to cease repeating the prayers even in private: but the decree does not expressly enjoin this to be done. The two short prayers constituting the devotion are: "My Jesus, pardon and mercy by the merits of thy holy wounds" and "Eternal Father, I offer Thee the wounds of Our Lord Jesus Christ for the healing of our souls' wounds".

iii. The devotion is prohibited, not because of these two prayers, but because of the adjuncts thereto, namely inconsistencies in the alleged revelation,² exaggerations in the attached promises, e.g. the liberation of five souls from Purgatory each time one looks at a crucifix with a pure heart; and, generally speaking, the incongruous character of all the circumstances which do, it seems, merit the description "ridiculous" and argue

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1937, XIII, p. 315.

² Cf. Fr. Crehan, S.J., in THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, XIX, p. 418.

against the truth of the revelations, whilst nevertheless leaving intact the character of the excellent religious who is said to have received them.¹ Not all of these suspected elements are printed in all the popular leaflets; the prayers and some of the objectionable features are occasionally found in private devotions for the Stations of the Cross, and they should be removed from future editions.

"EN EGO": RECEIVING HOLY COMMUNION

Applying the general principles of canons 931 and 933, does it not follow that a plenary indulgence may be gained daily by reciting *En Ego* each day for a week provided Holy Communion is received once during the week? (R.)

REPLY

Canon 931, §1: Ad quaslibet indulgentias lucrandas confessio forte requisita peragi potest intra octo dies qui immediate praecedunt diem cui indulgentia fuit affixa; communio autem in pervigilio eiusdem diei; utraque vero etiam intra subsequenter totam octavam.

Canon 933: Uni eidemque rei vel loco plures ex variis titulis adnecti possunt indulgentiae; sed uno eodemque opere, cui ex variis titulis indulgentiae adnexae sint, non possunt plures acquiri indulgentiae, nisi opus requisitum sit confessio vel communio, aut nisi aliud expresse cautum fuerit.

Preces et Pia Opera, n. 171: Fidelibus, supra relatam orationem coram Iesu Christi Crucifixi imagine pie recitantibus, conceditur. . . . *Indulgentia plenaria*, si praeterea sacramentalem confessionem instituerint, caelestem Panem sumpserint et ad mentem Summi Pontificis oraverint.

S. Poenit., 13 March, 1928 (private); *Periodica*, 1928, p. 74: . . . orator petit an sufficiat, ad lucrandam dictam indulgentiam plenariam, Communio facta in pervigilio vel intra subse-

¹ Cf. *Apollinaris*, 1941, p. 92.

quentem totam octavam, ad normam Can. 931 C.I.C. *Resp.* . . . Non spectare, et rem proponendam esse ad Commissionem pro authentica interpretatione canonum C.I.C.

i. The *En Ego* prayer, to which a plenary indulgence was attached in 1858, was at one time the only pious exercise of its kind so enriched with a daily plenary indulgence. We have, now, a prayer to Christ the King (n. 254), and the recitation of a third part of the Rosary (n. 360 (c)) before the Blessed Sacrament, by which a plenary indulgence may be gained daily. The reply of the Sacred Penitentiary, 13 March, 1928, related to this recitation of the Rosary, the question put being on the meaning of the words "iuxta morem" omitted in *Preces*, n. 360, which qualified reception of Holy Communion in the original rescript dated 4 September, 1927. Rather surprisingly the Sacred Penitentiary declined to elucidate their meaning, and referred the questioner to the *Code Commission* since, apparently, the doubt was concerned with the two canons 931 and 933. We have never seen the Commission's answer, and perhaps the question was not put. But it is clear that the solution will apply equally to the recitation of *En Ego*.

ii. An affirmative answer was given by Vermeersch in *Periodica*, 1928, p. 75: "Et cum c. 933 confessionem et s. communionem excipiat ab operibus quibus, nisi repetantur, plures indulgentiae acquiri, variis titulis, nequeant, inde diximus cotidie memoratam indulgentiam prostare ei qui singulis hebdomadis ad s. synaxim accedat, quotiescumque tertiam partem Rosarii coram Sanctissimo recitaverit." This solution may be accepted, if desired, and applied to the prayer *En Ego*. Owing to this prayer being printed, for nearly a century, amongst devotions after Holy Communion, we have grown accustomed to the notion that, to gain the indulgence, it must be recited immediately after receiving this sacrament, and many think it must be said before they leave the church. Actually, as is evident, the condition of receiving the sacraments is practically identical with the condition attached to many other indulgenced devotions.

The solution favoured by Vermeersch was also given, independently, by a writer in *The Ecclesiastical Review*, August, 1941, p. 138. The usual commentators on the Code and the writers

on indulgences consulted do not advert to the point, with one important exception.

iii. A negative answer is favoured by De Angelis, an official of the Sacred Penitentiary, in *De Indulgentiis*, §81, and though the writer is careful to explain in the preface that his office adds nothing to the authority of his treatise (*agitur enim de libera dissertatione quam omnes fas est participare*), one cannot help thinking that his opinion will eventually prove to be correct: "Putamus igitur quod Communio utique fieri potest in pervigilio diei cui indulgentia fuit affixa et per totam subsequentem octavam, sed tot requiruntur Communiones quot sunt dies quibus una vel plures indulgentiae acquiri possunt."

The reason for this opinion is, of course, that the opposite view appears to contradict the well-known rule of canon 931, §3, declaring a daily (or almost daily) Communion to suffice for obtaining all indulgences requiring the reception of the sacraments as a condition.¹ It would appear that the opinion given in (ii) substitutes weekly Communion for the (almost) daily Communion required in canon 931, §3.

De Angelis interprets canon 933 to mean that many indulgences *obtainable on the same day* may be gained by receiving Holy Communion once, whenever its reception is a condition. But this meaning, though likely, is not certain, and we must await a decision of the Code Commission on the point.

STATIONS' CRUCIFIX

A question has arisen from the reply about the Collection for the Holy Places, 1948, XXIX, p. 340. In addition to certain indulgences, the parish priest who arranged this collection in his church was granted the faculty of blessing crucifixes for the Stations' indulgence obtainable by persons prevented from making the Stations in the usual way. Could it be held that, notwithstanding the general withdrawal of such faculties in 1933, this particular one remains? If not, how does one apply for it? (E.)

¹ Cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1939, XVII, p. 69.

REPLY

i. The faculty as described was granted by the Holy See, 26 June, 1894, confirming the previous grant of 8 June, 1887. The text is not in the usual collections but is described by Beringer, *Les Indulgences* (1925), I, §801, with a reference to *Analect. Ord. Min.*, XIII, 131.

The important decree which withdrew such faculties from 1 April, 1933, is printed in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1946, XXVI, p. 316, and the chief thing to note about it is that its terms are not retrospective. Priests already in possession of this and other faculties, which used to be obtained easily by joining some pious association, retain them; on the other hand, priests joining such associations after 1 April, 1933, obtain only very reduced faculties, excluding amongst others the faculty of blessing a Stations' Crucifix.

ii. For the view that the faculty is still obtained by arranging the Holy Places Collection, it could be argued that it was not granted to those joining a pious association but to parish priests performing a specified pious work, and that it was given more-over in perpetuity. For the opposite view, it may be claimed that the intention underlying the decree of withdrawal in 1933 covers this faculty also, and it could also be held that it was actually attached to a pious association, namely the Franciscan "*Pium Opus a Terra Sancta*"; and that, accordingly, the faculty ceases at least in regard to parish priests not attached to this pious work before 1 April, 1933.

A private reply of the Sacred Penitentiary, 9 April, 1940,¹ is as follows: "*Tuxta hodiernam praxim parochi, de quibus in precibus, ad hoc S. Tribunal recurrere debent ut facultate, de qua supra, uti possint.*" The decision neither states that the faculty has ceased, nor that it is still existing, but that recourse should be had to the Sacred Penitentiary before the faculty can be used. The question discussed in the previous paragraph seems therefore to be still alive, since it is not clear whether "*possint*" means for the valid or the merely lawful use of the faculty. However, for all practical purposes, one must have recourse to the Holy See.

¹ *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1940, p. 92.

iii. The formula of application given by the most recent writer on indulgences is as follows:¹ "Beatissime Pater, N.N. sacerdos dioecesis . . . (*vel Ordinis seu Congregationis* . . .) ad pedes Sanctitatis Tuae provolutus, humillime petit facultatem benedicendi crucifixos ad lucrandas sacrae Viae Crucis Indulgentias pro legitime impeditis a visitandis eiusdem Viae Crucis stationibus ad normam Sanctae Sedis ad rem concessionum. Et Deus, etc." The petition must be sent to Rome through one's own Ordinary together with his own recommendation.

MARRIAGE BEFORE WITNESSES—RELIGIOUS RITE

In the unusual event of a marriage before witnesses, without the presence of priest, what is the religious or liturgical formula to be used? (F.)

REPLY

Canon 1098: Si haberi vel adiri nequeat sine gravi incommodo parochus vel Ordinarius vel sacerdos delegatus qui matrimonio assistat ad normam canonum 1095, 1096:

i. In mortis periculo validum et licitum est matrimonium contractum coram solis testibus; et etiam extra mortis periculum, dummodo prudenter praevideatur eam rerum conditionem esse per mensem duraturam.

Propaganda, 23 June, 1830; *Fontes*, n. 4749. Secundo, si missionarius adiri nequeat, et ineundi matrimonii urgeat necessitas, atque aliunde nullum omnino obstat impedimentum, tali casu, parentes duos testes eligant, qui una cum sponso et sponsa, eorumque propinquis ad ecclesiam loci se conferentes, flexis genibus, consuetos fidei, spei, charitatis et contritionis actus in communi recitent, sicque sponsus et sponsa ad contrahendum matrimonium rite se disponant. Post haec surgentes sponsus et sponsa coram praedictis testibus per verba de praesenti mutuum exprimant consensum, et post gratias Deo actas domum revertantur. Si autem ad ecclesiam ire nequeant, in privatis domibus praedicta observentur.

¹ De Angelis, *De Indulgentiis* (1946), p. 318.

There can be no question of a liturgical formula in such cases, but merely of securing at the reception of the sacrament a due measure of religious observance, and the suggestions of *Propaganda* offered to a Chinese Vicar-Apostolic, without being of strict obligation, do give us some idea of what the Church expects from Christians contracting marriage: preparation by making acts of the theological virtues and thanksgiving afterwards.

In places where the *Ordo Administrandi* is used, the exhortation which is printed in the editions previous to 1915 could be read by the oldest man present before and after the contract, with the exception of the last few lines of each which suppose a priest to be reading the text.

The exchange of consent could be expressed as in nn. 2 and 3 of the English rite, and even though the ring has not been blessed we can see no reason why the formula in n. 6 "With this ring I thee wed" should not also be used.

The parties and the witnesses are bound "in solidum", from canon 1103, §2, to see that a marriage thus contracted is inscribed in the parochial register of the place; and later, when the opportunity offers, the full liturgical form exclusive of the words "Ego coniungo vos", etc., should be supplied, as directed on other occasions by *Propaganda*.¹

THE "SIXES" CANDLESTICKS

Is the rule requiring these to be of graduated height of obligation? May they be made of wood? (B. C.)

REPLY

Caerem. Epp., I, xii, 11. Supra vero in planitie altaris adsint candelabra sex argentea, si haberi possunt: sin minus ex aurichalco, aut cupro aurato nobilius fabricata. . . Ipsa candelabra non sint omnino inter se aequalia, sed paulatim, quasi per gra-

¹ Vromant, *Ius Missionariorum*, V, §213.

dus ab utroque altaris latere surgentia, ita ut ex eis altiora sint immediate hinc inde a lateribus crucis posita.

S.R.C., 21 July, 1855, n. 3035.7. . . . Verum in tota dioecesi Briocensi sunt omnino inter se aequalia. Quaeritur utrum hoc praescriptum Caeremonialis Episcoporum ea de re sit rigore tenendum? et si affirmative, petitur, ut iis Candelabris inter se aequalibus in omnibus Ecclesiis seu Cappellis uti liceat, donec admodum renovanda sunt. *Resp.* Adductam causam a praescriptione Caeremonialis observanda excusare.

The text of the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* supposes that the church possesses more than one set of sixes, silver candlesticks being used on greater feasts and metal gilt on other days; the silver ones are forbidden in the same book, II, xxii, 4, on Good Friday. The perfect observance of these directions is to be recommended, and likewise the rule that the candlesticks should be of graduated height.

The reply, n. 3035.7, is sometimes cited by the writers as stating that the rule of the *Caeremoniale* is not of obligation,¹ whereas it merely declares, very reasonably, that places which already have candlesticks of equal size may continue to use them indefinitely. Nevertheless, the writers universally teach that the graduated size is not of strict obligation, the ultimate reason being, no doubt, that custom has sanctioned a non-observance of the rule. In the Roman basilicas, and in all the illustrations we have seen of altars, as in the work of Dom Roulin, the candlesticks are equal in size. One occasionally sees the candles themselves graduated in size, or the gradines themselves graduated, but neither of these methods is, we think, to be recommended.

Similarly, the writers we have consulted allow candlesticks of wood, which is the custom in Franciscan churches.²

E. J. M.

¹ E.g. Collins, *The Church Edifice and its Appointments*, p. 119.

² Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 118; *Nuntius Aulæ*, 1936, p. 48; *Directions for Altar Societies*, p. 25.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

THE WORKS OF SARTRE CONDEMNED

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO SANCTI OFFICII

DECRETUM

Proscriptio librorum *Feria IV, die 27 octobris 1948*

(*Osservatore Romano*, 8 Nov. 1948)

In generali consessu Supremae Sacrae Congregationis S. Officii E.mi ac Rev.mi DD. Cardinales rebus fidei et morum tutandis praepositi, praehabito RR. DD. Consultorum voto, decreverunt in INDICEM librorum prohibitorum inserenda *Opera omnia* a Ioanne Paulo SARTRE conscripta.

Et sequenti *Feria V*, die 28 eiusdem mensis et anni, SS.mus D. N. PIUS Divina Providentia Pp. XII, in solita Audientia Exc.mo ac Rev.mo D. Adessori Sancti Officii concessa, relatum Sibi E.morum Patrum resolutionem adprobavit, confirmavit et publicari iussit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sancti Officii, die 30 octobris 1948.

PETRUS VIGORITA

Supr. S. Congr. S. Officii Notarius.

This decree of the Holy Office will not come as a surprise to anyone familiar with even the general outlines of the published work of Sartre. As Fr Fabro points out, in an article in the *Osservatore Romano*, dated 8 November, 1948, both the immorality and atheism of Sartre's writings have already provoked the disapproval of secular and liberal circles. Even atheistic communists themselves have made bitter attacks upon him. Among Catholics, Fr Descoqs, for instance, speaks of the necessity of using tongs and closing one's nostrils if the effort is to be made to study the existentialist writings of Sartre, and affirms that the reading of them should be forbidden to all self-respecting men and women who are not obliged by reason of their duty to gain some knowledge of them.

Sartre is, of course, the leading exponent of one particular form of existentialism. Philosophers of this school, in general, manifest a distrust for abstract reasoning. They consider that the value of abstract thought has been highly exaggerated and that such exag-

generation has been responsible for the emergence of philosophies like that of Hegel and his disciples which are at the furthest remove from reality, and give no help to men in the solution of their very real problems. The remedy, they say, for this state of affairs is to be found in a return to actual conditions and things. Philosophers must study men and their problems as they actually exist: they must try to *live* these problems and come to a solution of them by some kind of intuition, and not by erecting abstract systems totally divorced from reality. The result of such efforts with some philosophers, Marcel for example, has been to come to a real knowledge of God. Existentialism of this type is in no way affected by the Church's condemnation of Sartre. With others, unfortunately, the result has been quite different. They consider that God is nothing but the product of abstract thinking, the empty "absolute". Their existentialism compels them in consequence to envisage reality without God. Sartre is an example of this type. He is a self-professed atheist. God, he says, is impossible. His whole work presupposes and tries to prove this assertion. In consequence he must deny all those features of reality which in a Christian philosophy are evident signs of the existence of a wise creator. For Sartre, there is no final explanation of reality, there is no purpose in reality, there is no design or order. Things just are—they need not be, but they are—they are *de trop*. Man is a particular kind of thing. In addition to being, he has the power of consciousness, a power which serves no real purpose apart from enabling him to realize the utter absurdity of reality and the meaninglessness of existence.

The liberty of man, which Sartre admits, is not in consequence directed to any end. It is pure liberty, freedom from all law and all restraint. The pernicious effects of this conception of liberty in matters affecting morality are not hard to foresee. This probably explains why Sartre is so concerned in his novels with those features of human nature and human activity which make it difficult for us to remember that man is made in the image of God. Many critics have found it difficult to admit even any literary merit in Sartre's descriptions of the brutalities and bestialities to which human nature sometimes descends.

This is not to deny the real ability of Sartre to write well and to argue with skill and subtlety. Perhaps this is the reason why his books are dangerous enough to merit the condemnation of the Church.

Of his books the most frequently referred to are the following: *L'Être et le Néant* (his major philosophical work), *Les chemins de la liberté*, *La Nausée*, *L'Âge de raison*, *Le Mur*, *Les Mouches*.

G. E.

**CENTENARY OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF
MELBOURNE****EPISTULA**

AD EXCĒMUM P. D. DANIELEM MANNIX, ARCHIEPISCOPUM MELBURNENSEM: SAECULO VERTENTE AB ECCLESIA MELBURNENSI CONSTITUTA
(*A.A.S.*, 1948, XL, p. 177).

PIUS PP. XII

Venerable Brother, Health and Apostolic Benediction.—With profound pleasure, Venerable Brother, do We send you this message of cordial greeting and felicitation on the auspicious occasion of the Centenary of the Archdiocese of Melbourne.

One hundred years ago the first Bishop, the enterprising John A. Goold, took possession of the Diocese newly erected by Our predecessor of blessed memory, Pius IX. Since then the history of Melbourne has been one of continued progress and advancement, keeping pace with the history of Victoria and of the entire Continent of Australia. As the resources of the country were gradually explored and developed, the population of Victoria rapidly increased, thereby creating an urgent and arduous problem for the first Bishop of the new Diocese, upon whom devolved the responsibility of providing for the religious needs of the numerous Catholic immigrants.

The providence of God, governing all things with infinite wisdom, was not unmindful of the needs of the growing Catholic communities scattered over those wide areas. As the numbers of the faithful multiplied, missionary priests were found for the new harvest-field—men endowed with the physical endurance and with the zeal and firmness of purpose which were required for laying the foundations of the Church in the pioneer days of Australia. Through their energetic and self-sacrificing toil, Churches and Chapels were built in the various centres and soon the Province of Victoria was so well developed that portions of the original territory of Melbourne were erected into the separate Dioceses of Ballarat, Sandhurst and Sale.

Convinced that all efforts on behalf of the Catholic cause would have been in vain unless the children were provided with a sound Christian education, Archbishop Goold set about the difficult task of establishing Catholic schools for the youth of the Diocese, and for this purpose he enrolled the services of devoted religious, both men

and women. With their devoted collaboration, and supported by the generous sacrifices of his flock, the worthy Pastor laid the foundations of that network of institutions of Catholic education and of charity which adorn the Archdiocese of Melbourne today.

Through the persevering exertions of Archbishop Carr, the Cathedral of Saint Patrick was completed and consecrated in 1897. That majestic and stately edifice, dedicated to the Patron Saint of the country to which Australia is indebted for her first missionaries and for the majority of her Catholic immigrants, stands today as a monument of architecture dominating the city of Melbourne. In its contrast to the original Chapel in which Melbourne's first Mass was celebrated in 1839, it typifies and reflects the spiritual and material growth of the Diocese during those hundred years.

Your own zealous efforts, Venerable Brother, have contributed in no small way to the flourishing condition of which the Archdiocese of Melbourne can be justly proud on the occasion of its Centenary. Not content with merely consolidating the meritorious achievements of your worthy predecessors, you have laboured incessantly to continue that progress and development which had characterized the Archdiocese since its erection. Under your auspices, and due to your untiring labours, churches, schools, presbyteries, religious houses and convents increased and multiplied. No longer dependent on priests from other countries or from other Seminaries, the Diocese now has its own Corpus Christi College for the training of ministers of the Gospel worthy to take the place and follow in the footsteps of the heroic missionaries of the pioneer days.

In addition to strengthening and expanding the primary and secondary educational institutes of the Diocese, your solicitude, Venerable Brother, for the proper Catholic formation of the faithful under your charge has extended itself also to the field of higher studies. Confiding in Divine Providence and relying once more on the generosity of your people; you courageously undertook the task of providing a Catholic University education for the youth of both sexes, and today Newman College and Saint Mary's College stand as monuments to your unquenchable zeal and indefatigable labours.

Aware, too, of the importance of the Catholic press, you have continued and perfected the work begun by your predecessors and have made Melbourne an active centre for the production and distribution of Catholic literature not only within the boundaries of the Archdiocese itself but throughout the other Provinces of the vast Continent as well.

Verily these have been a hundred years of proud achievement. God has blessed your apostolic activity and that of your predecessors

with a rich harvest, and the Archdiocese of Melbourne as it stands today represents a well-nigh miraculous growth from the humble beginnings of a century ago. Not only have the faithful multiplied numerically but their common struggle for the sound establishment of the Church and especially for the maintenance of their schools has united them together in closely-knit bonds of solidarity. The people of today are reaping the fruits of the sacrifices made by their forefathers on behalf of Catholic education, and the graduates of the present-day schools and colleges are young men and women well instructed in the truths of their religion and imbued with a sensitive awareness of their duties as Catholics. Religious and lay confraternities and charitable organizations have been active in the Archdiocese for many years, while various forms of Catholic Action have been firmly established and are producing consoling fruits, particularly amongst the working classes, whom the Church has always cherished with especial care and whose interests she has always defended and promoted with maternal solicitude.

Very cordially indeed do We congratulate you, Venerable Brother, on the noble part you have played in the spiritual and material advancement of the Archdiocese entrusted to your pastoral care thirty-one years ago, and in the organization and direction of every aspect of its intense Catholic life. On this happy occasion of the Centenary, We rejoice with you and with the clergy, religious and faithful of Melbourne, and, while expressing to each and all of you Our sincere felicitations, We join Our voice with yours in rendering heartfelt thanks to Almighty God.

We have learned of your intention, Venerable Brother, of consecrating your Archdiocese and the entire Continent of Australia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. It is Our earnest prayer that the Mother of God may deign to accept your devoted offering, and that under Her especial protection and under your enlightened guidance and that of your Brothers in the Hierarchy, your beloved country may be preserved immune from the erroneous political and social doctrines of our time and may continue on its path of prosperity and spiritual progress.

We pray, furthermore, that Almighty God may continue to bless and prosper the Archdiocese of Melbourne, that the people may persevere in the faithful practice of their religion and in that spirit of undying attachment to the Holy See which has always characterized them, that the Catholic Action movement may further grow and develop, and that an abundance of priestly vocations may provide a zealous native clergy to carry on the laudable work begun by the brave-hearted Irish missionaries of the past.

With this prayer, We lovingly impart to you, Venerable Brother, to the priests, religious and laity of the Archdiocese of Melbourne and to all participating in the Centenary celebrations Our fatherly Apostolic Benediction.

Given in Rome, from St. Peter's, on the sixth day of April nineteen hundred and forty eight, in the tenth year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS PP. XII

THE IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY

EPISTULA

AD EXCĒMUM P. D. LUCIANUM LEBRUN, EPISCOPUM AUGUSTODUNENSEM CABILLONENSEM ET MATISCONENSEM: OB COMMEMORATIONEM PRAEDICATIONIS A S. IOANNE EUDES, SUB PRAESIDIO IMMACULATI CORDIS B. MARIAE V. TRIBUS ABHINC SAECULIS INCEPTAE, IN AUGUSTODUNENSI DIOECESI (*A.A.S.*, 1948, XL, p. 106).

PIUS PP. XII

Venerabilis Frater, salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.—Ex officiosis litteris, abs te et a generali Eudistarum Moderatore recens datis, libenti didicimus animo percipere vos eventum celebrare, quod possit, ut in votis est, cleri populique pietatem incendere erga magnam Dei Parentem dulcissimamque Matrem nostram. Tribus nempe abhinc saeculis, cum Ioannes Eudes, "aeternarum praeco disertissimus veritatum",¹ una cum viginti sociis in singulis Augustoduni templis sacrarum concionum cursum habuisset, atque innumerabiles multitudines ad Christum ad eiusque sanctissima sequenda praecepta reduxisset, laudabili eo consilio permotus ut perseverans in virtute studium a Deo facilius impetraretur, ab immaculato Beatae Virginis Corde publice voluit praesidium ab omnibus implorari. Primum siquidem, eo auctore suasoreque, et Ecclesiae probante auctoritate, Eucharisticum Sacrificium in eiusdem immaculati Cordis honorem celebratum est, cuius ipse preces ac formulas composuerat.

Hoc Nos eventum in christianae plebis memoriam revocari valde opportunum ducimus, cum fore confidamus ut, quemadmodum Ioannis Eudes aetate, sic in praesens possint, uberibus cum fructibus, christifidelium animi hac ratione converti atque excitari non modo ad cultum provehendum Deiparae Virginis, et ad flagrantiore erga

¹ Homil. Pii XI in Canoniz. S. J. Eudes; *A.A.S.*, vol. XVII, p. 225.

eam amorem commovendum, sed ad eius etiam virtutum exempla imitanda. Quod quidem, si umquam alias, nostris hisce temporibus omnino videtur necessarium.

Paucis ante annis, ut omnes norunt, cum immane adhuc fureret bellum, Nos—quandoquidem gravissimae huiusmodi conflictationis componendae humanae spes humanaeque opes ancipites atque incertae videbantur—ad miserentissimum Redemptorem nostrum precando supplicandoque confugimus, validissimo interposito patrocinio purissimi Cordis Mariae Virginis. Ac sicut Decessor Noster fel. rec. Leo XIII, vicesimo ineunte saeculo, universum hominum genus sacratissimo Cordi Iesu dedicatum voluit, ita Nos pariter, quasi humanae familiae divinitus redemptae sustinentes personam, eam volumus immaculato etiam Deiparae Virginis Cordi sollemniter consecrare.

In praesens vero, etsi bellum fere ubique conquievit, nondum tamen sedata sunt odia, neque discordiae sunt contentionesque compositae. Quin immo ipsa civilis societatis compages summo in discrimine videtur, dum tam multae nationes ac gentes, tot plagis adhuc sauciae, tot ruinis ac detrimentis afflictae, quorsum novi anni cursus contendat reformidando considerant.

Non est igitur a divino efflagitando auxilio desistendum, neque ab imploranda tutela beatae Virginis Mariae cessandum, cuius sine ope qui velit superna obtinere munera, supernumque praesidium, is sine alarum remigio inaniter ad excelsa evolare videatur.¹ Quamobrem optime facitis, si huius eventus faustitatem commemorantes, opportunam ex ea nanciscimini occasionem rationemque, qua facilius possitis popularem inflammare pietatem erga Dei Matrem benignissimam, eamque, quasi pacis sequestram ac caelestium munerum conciliatricem omnibus indicare ac commendare.

Adsit e caelo consilii atque inceptis hisce vestris S. Ioannes Eudes, ac vobis valida prece sua impetret, ut salutares illi fructus, quos, tribus ante saeculis, apud vos divina favente gratia edidit, iterum feliciterque renoventur.

Nos interea, horum caelestium fructuum auspiciem Nostraeque benevolentiae testem, cum tibi, Venerabilis frater, ac dilecto filio Francisco Lebesconte, generali Eudistarum Moderatori, tum eius sodalibus, itemque universo gregi tuae vigilantiae demandato, Apostolicam Benedictionem effuso animo impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, die xv mensis Ianuarii, anno MDCCCXXXVIII, Pontificatus Nostri nono.

PIUS PP. XII

¹ Cf. DANTES ALIGH., *Parad.*, XXXIII, 14-15.

BOOK REVIEWS

Existentialism and Modern Man. (Aquinas Papers, No. 9.) By F. C. Copleston, S.J., M.A. Pp. 28. (Blackfriars, Oxford. Price 1s. 6d.)

In this paper, originally read to the Aquinas Society of London in 1948, Fr Copleston gives "not an exposition of existentialism, but rather a partial explanation of its rise and vogue". However much the philosophies of Kierkegaard, Jaspers, Heidegger, Marcel, Sartre and Camus may differ, they have certain common features which enable us to describe them as manifestations of a definite trend. First, in all these philosophies there is a renewed interest in what may be called peculiarly human problems. Problems concerning right conduct, liberty, destiny, personal relationships, are not of the kind to be solved by science which deals on the whole with things that can be measured and subjected to experiment. The metaphysical systems of the last century are not particularly helpful either. Hence the attempt by existentialist philosophers to approach these problems, neither by the way of physical science nor by rational metaphysics, but by some kind of direct contact with the existent individual, by direct experience. Secondly, Fr Copleston points out, existentialism is a reaction against collectivism and totalitarianism. This is not surprising in view of the interest of existentialist philosophers in personal and individual problems. Whoever concentrates his attention on individuals in an attempt to live their problem is bound to react against any system that would reduce the individual to the position of a cog in the racial or universal machine. A third feature of existentialism is its interest in transcendental reality, whether this takes the form of a denial of such reality, as with Sartre and Camus, or of the affirmation of an absolute being, as with Jaspers and Marcel. Above all, existentialism is essentially a philosophy of a particular period. Fr Copleston is of the opinion that it will inevitably give way to new systems of philosophy, unless of course Europe is on the point of entering into an intellectual Dark Age.

In short, existentialism, in what seems to be the view of Fr Copleston, is a philosophy born of dissatisfaction with the oversimplifications of physical science and the inadequacy of rational metaphysics (by rational metaphysics is meant primarily the "great" systems of the last century). To this extent it is perhaps a hopeful sign. Its danger lies clearly in its exaggerated distrust of reason, and its appeal to emotionalism. For the rest, one branch of existentialism has solved human problems by a "rediscovery" of God; the other

branch has despaired of a solution, having accepted "the death of God".

Fr Copleston stresses throughout that the explanations he gives are only partial, owing, of course, to the necessity of dealing with a widespread philosophical trend in a few pages. Nevertheless the reader will find here sufficient material to form some idea of the general character of existentialist philosophy, and to pass a general judgement on its value.

G. E.

The Catholic Doctor. By Fr A. Bonnar, O.F.M., D.D. Pp. 168. (Burns Oates and Washbourne. 8s. 6d.)

THIS is the fourth edition of a treatise which has become established as probably the best explanation of medical ethics in English, and is now well known both to priests and doctors. Except for an extended explanation of the problems connected with artificial insemination, there are few changes of any great moment in this new edition, and we may be permitted merely to repeat that the book can be strongly recommended to the medical profession, to the clergy and to students of moral theology. It can be recommended most strongly of all to the clergy who, having puzzling cases of medical ethics brought to their notice, find it far more agreeable to hand them on to Fr Bonnar for solution. This habit is, indeed, most flattering to the learned author from one point of view; on the other hand, it means burdening him with a formidable correspondence. His plea in the preface to this edition is just and reasonable: correspondents are requested, before writing to him, to make sure that the problem has not already been solved either explicitly or by implication in the pages of the book.

Nazareth. A Book of Counsel and Prayer for the Married. By Dom J. K. Scheuber, O.S.B., and Ven. Archdeacon MacMahon. Pp. 278. (Eason & Son, Dublin. 6s. 6d. to 13s. 6d., according to the binding.)

THIS excellent little work, original in its ideas and construction and produced in the form of a prayer-book, is of Swiss German origin and adapted for use amongst English-speaking Catholics by Venerable Archdeacon MacMahon. It has five parts: Motherhood, The Child Conceived, At the Cradle of a Child, At the Sources of Grace, The Mother in her Home, each part being composed of a pleasing selection of prayers, devotions and instructions.

Liturgical extracts are prominent, as one would expect from the experienced adapter who is responsible for the current Irish *Benedictionale*. Amongst other texts we are given the Nuptial Mass, the

Blessing of a Woman after Childbirth and the Blessing of an Infant, all of which are replete with solid instruction and devotion.

Amongst the non-liturgical devotions is a formula of prayer to Our Lady, which might very well be adopted for use when it is desired to consecrate an infant after Baptism to Our Lady, a devout practice of which particulars are often requested by the readers of this journal. We are informed also of a pious custom which may be common in Swiss Catholic Cantons and is worthy of imitation everywhere: the candle given to the sponsor at Baptism is produced lighted at every subsequent religious landmark of the child's life, as at Confirmation, First Communion, or Marriage.

The instructions cover such matters as birth control, the lawfulness of using the infertile period, and baptism in cases of necessity. Prominent amongst these instructions are exhortations addressed by the Holy Father on various occasions to the newly-wed; also the substance of the papal teaching on sex instruction, which first appeared in an English rendering made by the editor for this REVIEW, and is now widely circulating as a C.T.S. pamphlet entitled *The Pope Speaks to Mothers*.

The book is eminently worthy of appearing in English, and it will not fail to benefit the devout faithful who will find therein everything necessary for a deeper understanding of a great sacrament.

The Administrative Removal of Parish Priests. By Rev. A. Ronchetti, J.C.L. Pp. 78. (Burns Oates. 4s. 6d.)

To those interested in practical questions of canon law it is a standing mystery why the Code gives so minute a description of ecclesiastical trials, seeing that, apart from marriage causes which have their own rules, one never hears of a case being tried; it is the rarest exception, even in the modern collections of Rotal judgements, to find any other contentious issues settled by a formal trial. Instead, it is the modern practice to settle disputes *modo administrativo*, and the growth of this practice causes many a headache to canonists owing to the lack of any clearly defined procedure.

The removal of parish priests is a notable exception. The procedure was settled before the Code in *Maxima Cura* and is set out in canons 2147-2167. Apart from the usual Latin commentators, there is in English a Washington thesis (n. 104) on the subject by Rev M. O'Connor, published in 1937, which has in mind the conditions existing in America. In England it is unusual for Ordinaries to have recourse to the canonical procedure of removal, but a description of the rules written by one who, in addition to an exacting course of

Roman studies, occupies the important curial position of chancellor in the diocese of Leeds, cannot fail to be of interest to the clergy. It is always good to know one's rights, even though for a variety of reasons they will never be used, and we know of no commentator who explains them in English so expertly as Dr Ronchetti. In a relatively small space the author deals with every situation or doubt that is likely to arise, and gives authorities for his conclusions.

The requirement of a printed thesis as part of the examination for the doctorate must necessarily result in a large number of publications, the value of which to the public at large is not always evident. It is a requirement, however, which is more than justified by such theses as this, which was presented to the Canon Law Faculty of the Gregorian University and carries the imposing "approbamus" of Fr Cappello and Fr Bouscaren.

E. J. M.

The Angel Who Guarded the Toys. By Doris Burton. Pp. 171. (Sands, 15 King Street, W.C.2. 7s. 6d.) *The Wanderings of Wopsy.* By Gerard F. Scriven, W.F. Pp. 89. (Walker, 27 Chancery Lane, W.C.2. 3s.) *Angels Come to Mass.* By Sr M. Ansgar, O.P. Pp. 48. (Bloomsbury Publishing Co., Ltd., W.C.1. 2s.)

THREE "angel" books by three different authors have this in common: each of the writers has an expert's understanding of children. The reading of Father Scriven's fourth "Wopsy" book and of Miss Burton's more grownish-up stories will prepare the way for using the outline book upon the Mass. Forming the right kind of idea in children's minds of spiritual things is a source of constant anxiety for Catholic teachers; they may rely upon these publications to help them in their apostolate.

A Heavenly Painting Book. Pp. 20. 4s. *The Stations of the Cross.* Pp. 14. 3s. 6d. *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.* Pp. 36. 1s. By Sister M. Ansgar, O.P. (Bloomsbury Publishing Co., Ltd., 34 Bloomsbury Street, W.C.1.)

A Rosary Chain. By Sister M. Dominic, O.P. Pp. 40. (Blackfriars, Oxford. 5s. 6d.)

CHILDREN's books, which can easily altogether escape the notice of priests, are deserving of attention when they are of practical use in the religious lesson. Here is a small parcel of excellent publications of real value to any priest whose work takes him into the school.

A Heavenly Painting Book comprises 136 drawings in outline to illustrate various chapters in the story of Christian Doctrine. The Spiritual and Corporal Works of Mercy, Capital Sins, Saints for boys

and girls, the daily life of Nazareth; these are typical of the twenty titles of the very large pages that make up this attractive work. It is published with the other books in this group as part of the Dominican Picture Apostolate.

The Stations of the Cross is a bound series of large quarto charts. What happened along the Via Dolorosa is set forth in boldly drawn pictures which will give to the child mind impressions that are truly Catholic.

The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is a small book of pictures to colour and to write about, and it provides a sure medium in teaching the sequence of events throughout the Mass. Only a priest would notice the few minor errors that have escaped the proof-reader.

A Rosary Chain (a quite lovely production, handset and printed on hand-made paper) makes a prize book for senior children. Texts from Holy Scripture, and original verses with their roots in the Scriptures, explain the Fifteen Mysteries. This book would lend itself admirably for adaptation as a Rosary Pageant.

Kianga. By Florence Hornback. Pp. 79. (St Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N.J.). (No price given.) *The Christmas House*. By Katharine Rook Davis. Pp. 184. (Douglas Organ, 140 Strand, W.C.2. 7s. 6d.) *Catechism Stories*. By Rev F. H. Drinkwater. Pp. xxix + 480. (Burns Oates. 15s.)

KIANGA is the story of the most privileged of donkeys, the humble little servant of the Holy Family. Children will love to read about him, especially since his story is told in so finely printed a book. The illustrations (by Robb Beebe) are in a class by themselves, Our Lady being depicted with a rare beauty of line by the very point of the pencil.

The Christmas House is for children of middle-school age; a pleasantly told holiday story of a happy and enthusiastic family of boys and girls. There is adventure and discovery, a touch of romance and the budding of a boy's vocation to the priesthood. Miss Davis maintains a note of keyed-up interest throughout an attractive book which is admirably suitable for a school prize.

The omnibus edition of Father Drinkwater's five books of *Catechism Stories* is the perfect supplement to any manual used in the teaching of Christian Doctrine. There are anecdotes and stories to illustrate all points in the curriculum for senior boys and girls. It is rarely sufficient to give the plain undecorated doctrine: illustration is essential for children—and here is the teacher's complete companion-book for the purpose.

L. T. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE VOCATION OF THE SECULAR CLERGY

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1948, XXX, pp. 289-304, 431)

Dr Towers writes:

I am reluctant to enter into controversy on the *Vocation of the Secular Clergy*, or even to comment on the points raised by "A Religious" in the December (1948) issue of THE CLERGY REVIEW. All of us, Secular and Regular, share in one priesthood, as he rightly says, and labour for the glory of God. Let us rejoice in our common possession and labour together for so great a cause. But if we are united in this common possession and this dedication to the cause of God there are important differences in the way we exercise our priesthood and carry out our labours. The life of a Religious who is also a priest has sacred features proper to it and the Religious is rightly inspired by them. But the life of a Secular priest has its glories too, and it was to these that I called attention for the encouragement of my brethren. They are great, though more easily ignored than those of a Religious; my friendly critic would not wish to rob us of them.

My appeal to the Ordinal was the result of years of meditation on it. I firmly believe that it has a special significance for the Secular Clergy since it is directly concerned with the creation of priests whose duty it will be to labour for God precisely as assistants of a diocesan Bishop. This was the original duty of priests. In the course of time Religious have come into the life of the Church and been raised to the priesthood by the same hallowed rites but not for the precise duties which are expressed in the Pontifical.

Since "A Religious" refers to priests who are ordained outside their own diocese, apparently implying that the link between them and their Bishop is thereby weakened, I would remark that when I was ordained priest forty-two years ago in the chapel of the German College in Rome by an Italian Cardinal that prelate called upon me to say if I pledged reverence and obedience to my own Bishop far away in England, thus stressing the fact that I was ordained to be a direct assistant of a particular Bishop in a particular diocese in his work as a successor of the apostles. The link was emphasized by the very formula used.

My reference to poverty in the life of a Secular priest, which has surprised "A Religious", was not meant to put the Secular priest on the same level as Religious from this point of view, for I clearly

recognize that a vow of poverty has special value in the eyes of God and His Church; but I was speaking of the way in which a Secular priest can find means of sanctification in the duties and circumstances of his life and pointing out that actual poverty may be one of them.

REPRESENTATION OF THE SACRED HEART

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1937, XIII, p. 268)

A Priest writes:

Within the last few months my attention has been drawn, by pious persons who have been rendered anxious thereby, to assertions made even by priests, and even from the pulpit, that the representation of the Sacred Heart without the rest of the Sacred Body is altogether prohibited.

I wonder therefore if, for the benefit of the simple persons who are distressed by being told that they are not allowed to have badges of the Sacred Heart, it may be thought worth while to draw attention again to the answer given in THE CLERGY REVIEW (1937, XIII, p. 268) to a question on this subject:

The practice is permitted as a private devotion, but it is forbidden to exhibit an emblem of this kind on altars for the public veneration of the faithful: *S.C.S. Off.*, August 26th, 1891, "Se le immagini rappresentanti il solo cuore senza il resto del corpo possono sicuramente dispensarsi. . . . Resp. Imaginem SSmi Cordis D.N.J.C. de qua agitur, privata ex devotione permitti, dummodo in altaribus publicae venerationi colenda non exponatur" (Gasparri, *Fontes*, IV, n. 1146).

I am assured on good authority that the above reply of 1891 has not been reversed.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

